REFUTING TAKFIRI STATEMENTS

WHAT IS TAKFIR AND WHAT ARE THE TYPES?

حدثنا محمد بن بشار حدثنا عثمان بن عمر حدثنا علي بن المبارك عن يحيى بن أبي كثير عن أبي قلابة أن ثابت بن الضحاك وكان من صحاب الشجرة حدثه أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال ثم من حلف على الإسلام فهو كما قال وليس على بن آدم نذر فيما لا يملك ومن قتل نفسه بشيء في الدنيا عذب به يوم القيامة ومن لعن مؤمنا فهو كقتله ومن قذف مؤمنا بكفر فهو كقتله

It is narrated by Dahhaak that the Messenger of Allah (SAW) said,

'Whoever curses a believer, it is as if he killed him and whoever throws the charge of kufr at a believer, it is as if he killed him.' [1]

حدثنا إسماعيل قال حدثني مالك عن عبد الله بن دينار عن عبد الله 5753 بن عمر رضي الله عنهما أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال ثم أيما رجل قال لأخيه يا كافر فقد باء بها أحدهما 5754 حدثنا موسى بن إسماعيل حدثنا وهيب حدثنا أيوب عن أبي قلابة عن ثابت بن الضحاك عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال ثم من حلف الإسلام كاذبا فهو كما قال

[1] Collected by Imaam alBukhaari رحمه الله and classified as sahih.

ومن قتل نفسه بشيء عذب به في نار جهنم ولعن المؤمن كقتله ومن رمى مؤمنا بكفر فهو كقتله

البيهقي و أحمد والبزار والطبراني الكبير ومجمع الزوائد ومسند أبي عوانة

It is narrated by `Abdullah ibn `Umar that the Prophet (SAW) said, ***'Whenever a man says to his brother, O kaafir, then one of them as one (a kaafir).'***

Dahhaak has also narrated that the Prophet (SAW) said, ***'Cursing a believer is like killing him. And whoever threw the charge of kufr as a believer, it is as if he killed him.'*** [2]

[2] Both ahaadith are collected by the Imaams Ahmad, alBazzaar, at-Tabaraani, alBaihaqi and mentioned in the Majma` uz-Zawaa'id and Musnad Abu `Awaanah رحمهم الله.

REFUTING TAKFIRI STATEMENTS

Introduction:

Dear brothers and sisters, this small work is to serve as another installment of warning the Ummah against future dangers. It should be the priority of those who have the ability to that they hasten to warn the Ummah against things that could harm them in this life and have consequences for the Hereafter.

For the past few years, the forces of Takfiri thinking have had their way. And that has included the physical assault of others, the injury of others, forced divorces without the permission of one of or both of the spouses involved, the self-appointment of walis without the permission of the sister and the sale and purchasing of narcotics to fund haraam activities.

But the most terrible of all is that the forces of exaggerated takfir have been responsible for the blurring of the clear and basic understanding of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah in the matter of takfir. From this, all the other acts mentioned above were made possible. It is absolutely necessary that these beliefs that are taught are answered and exposed for the benefit of the Ummah and for their safety.

WHAT IS KUFR AND WHO IS A KAAFIR?

With the abuse of takfir and the methodology of Ahl us-Sunna in regards to investigating the kufr of an individual, people have become targets for those who might have a personal grievance or show hatred towards them. This has led to some people being accused of major kufr, when in fact that has not been the case at all. It is now imperative, in order to block this type of intimidation, that an explanation of what exactly kufr is be forthcoming. After this explanation, the people can no longer be bullied with takfir or be bullied into making takfir when they are not in a position to do so.

Kufr (unbelief) in the linguistic sense: "It is covering something and veiling it. And all of what covers something, then it has done kufr to it. And from this, the farmer can be called a kaafir, for he covers the seed with the dirt. Likewise, Allah I has said,

كمثل غيث أعجب الكفار نباته

'The likeness of vegetation after rain, thereof the growth is pleasing to whoever (kuffar) that planted it.'[3]

"This means it is pleasing to the tiller, and from that the tiller is named to be a kaafir, for he has veiled the favour of Allah I. Al Azhari says,

---

[3] Surat ulHadid, ayah 20

'And His favours are his proven signs of His Tawhid. And the favours, which the kaafir has veiled, are the signs that enable the people to make the distinction that the Creator is One without partner. And likewise, he sent the Messengers with miraculous signs, books and abundant obvious proofs as a favour from Him.

'Thus whoever is not truthful to the favour, and he rejects it, then he has become a kaafir (showed unbelief) in the favour of Allah, meaning that he has covered and veiled the favour from himself.' "[4]

Shari`a definition of kufr: It is the complete decrease of imaan and it is the opposite of imaan. It is the unbelief in Allah, Mighty and Majestic, and His favours and the kufr here has two matters, kufrun **akbar** (**major** kufr) and kufrun **asghar** (**minor** kufr). In this case, the kufr is what the person is doing by covering the bounty and favour of Allah I from himself or others.

KUFRUN AKBAR (major kufr) In general, it is disbelief in Allah I, His Angels, His Messengers, His Books, The Day of Judgement and Divine Decree and Pre-ordainment, the good and the bad of it, in total or in any of these pillars. This also includes showing what is the opposite of the belief, for example by statements, actions and expressed beliefs of kufr that nullify imaan. Also, if he is not practicing the pillars of Islam that Allah I made as an apparent sign for a person to

[4] Taken from Lisaan ul`Arabi, under the word 'kufr.'

preserve his blood, honour and money, then this as well leads to apostasy. In our time, many people think that kufr is only to belie with the tongue, but this is not the belief of Ahl us-Sunna. There are many types of kufr that Allah mentioned in the Qur'an and the Sunna, but there are six in particular that constitute the major kufr.

a. **Juhud**. This is the denial of the signs of Allah I, whether it is a prophet, a miracle, an angel or a book brought by that prophet.

It has three forms,

1. *Juhud alQalb (the denial of the heart).* This is major kufr and happens to the people who have no link between their heart and their mind.

2. *Juhud alLisaan,* which is denying of the signs with the mouth, although the heart is satisfied with the truth. This denial is also called the juhud of arrogance and self-oppression (zulm). This is the most well known juhud for the evil tyrants. The Pharaoh of Egypt and his army remains one of history's greatest examples of Juhud al-Lisaan,

فلما جاءتهم آياتنا مبصرة قالوا هذا سحر مبين و جحدوا بها و استيقنتها أنفسهم ظلماً و علواً فانظر كيف كان عاقبة المفسدون

"Whereas when Our signs came to them, clear to see with insight, they said, 'This is clear and obvious magic. And they denied (juhud) them arrogantly and

***without reason, although they were convinced of it in themselves. So see what was the penalty of the corrupt ones. '"*[5]**

3. *Juhud al`Amal,* that being the juhud in action. This consists of the person not denying by the tongue, but denying by his action. This happens when he announces something opposite to what he has been told by Allah I, without contesting it directly. It is also when he acts opposite to the order deliberately, without contesting with the mouth.

The example for this type would be the individual that is a ruler and knows that the penalty for adultery in Islam is the death penalty. However, rather than implement the judgement of Allah I, he makes a rule that those who commit adultery are to be jailed only. Although he never denied the law per se, he has denied it simply by acting opposite to the order deliberately.

b. **Takdhib.** This matter here is to belie or to deny something from the words, signs or promise of Allah I, for example, the Judgement Day. There are three types,

1. *Takdhib alQalb,* where the **heart** rejects the truth.

2. *Takdhib alLisaan,* which has two forms,

[5] Surat un-Naml, ayaat 13-14

a. This is to directly contest by **saying,** "*Allah I said this, but that can't be right."*

b. This is the takdhib of **hinting** about. An example of this is if someone were to say, "Allah I said X." You then reply by saying, "No, Allah I said Y." The Mushrikun (pagans) said the same thing,

سيقول الذين أشركوا لو شاء الله ما أشركنا و لا اباؤنا و لا حرمنا من شيء كذلك كذب الذين من قبلهم حتى ذاقوا بأسنا

***"Those who make shirk (polytheism) will say, 'If Allah willed, we would not have associated partners, neither ourselves nor our fathers, and we would not have made haraam anything.' Likewise, those from before them lied until they tasted punishment."*[6]**

و قال الذين أشركوا لو شاء الله ما عبدنا من دونه من شيء نحن و لا اباؤنا و لا حرمنا من دون من شيء. كذلك فعل الذين من قبلهم فهل على الرسل إلا البلاغ المبين

"And those who make shirk (polytheism) say, 'If Allah had willed, we would have never worshipped anything besides Him, neither us nor our fathers. Nor would we have made haraam besides that anything.' Likewise,

[6] Surat ulAn`aam, ayah 147

those from before them did, so is it on the Messengers to give anything except the clear message?" [7]

3. *Takdhib al`Amal,* a person is doing an action that **shows** that he is denying. This example can be acted out with the following verses from the Qur'an,

أ رأيت الذي يكذب بالدين فذلك الذي يدع اليتيم و لا يحض على طعام المسكين

"Have you not seen the one who denied (takdhib) the religion? Then that is who was hard on the orphans and did not hasten to feed the poor. [8]***"*** [9]

These simple three verses here refute the false belief that you have to do major kufr in ***speech*** before you can leave the religion due to major kufr. These verses here show that this is not the case. The verse doesn't read, ***"Have you not heard" nor "Did he not deny with speech?"*** Of equal weight as well is the one who marries his mother. This Muslim who goes and commits this act exits from the religion of Islam and becomes a kaafir. He did not have to say anything in order to leave from the religion. The actions that he advertised showed

[7] Surat un-Nahl, ayah 35

[8] This does not mean that the person that doesn't feed the poor a kaafir, but this evidence shows clearly that Allah I has said that those who do the opposite of what they are told, they are doing the highest form of takdhib, which is the worse of all the forms. The rulers of today do this type of takdhib as well. If this is being done with the Shari`a, it causes one to go out of the religion, as with the case of the rulers.

[9] Surat ulMa`un, ayaat 1-3

that he was denying the rights of Allah I. The verses below can fit into the general category of Takdhib,

و ما أدراك ما يوم الفصل ويل يومئذ للمكذبين ألم نهلك الأولين

"And what will cause you to know what is the Day of Sorting (Judgement)? Woe be to the deniers (of the Day of Sorting) (takdhib). Did We not destroy those before?" [10]

c. **Istakbaar**. This kufr is actually being proud and haughty towards the truth and expressing arrogance when the signs of Allah I are presented,

إذ ربك للملائكة إني خالق بشراً من طين فإذا سويته و نفخت فيه من روحي فقعوا له ساجدين فسجد الملائكة كلهم أجمعون إلا إبليس استكبر و كان من الكافرين

"And when your Lord said, 'I am going to create a human being from clay. So when I have fashioned and shaped him and breathed into him his soul created by Me, then you are to prostrate to him.' So all of the angels prostrated, except Iblis. He was proud (istikbaar) and became a kaafir." [11]

d. **Istihzaa'**. This sin is the mocking or making jest of any of the signs of Allah I. This could be in jesting about the religion of Islam, or it could be mocking

[10] Surat ulMursalaat, ayaat 13-16

[11] Surah Saad, ayaat 71-74

something in the religion, like the veil over the face that Allah I made compulsory on the Muslim women, the verses from the Qur'an or statements and actions from the Prophet ρ. Allah I mentions the fate of such a people,

قل أ بالله و آياته و رسوله كنتم تستهزئون لا تعتذروا قد كفرتم بعد إيمانكم إن نعف عن طائفة منكم نعذبكم طائفة بأنهم كانوا مجرمون

"Say, 'Was it in Allah, His verses or His Messenger that you were mocking (istihzaa')? Make no excuse about it, you have disbelieved (become kuffar) after you had imaan. If we pardon a some of you, surely we will punish the others, for they were the criminals.' "[12]

e. **<u>I`raad</u>**. This aspect is turning away from and fleeing from whatever admonition and signs that Allah I gives to guide someone from the darkness to the light. These people are mentioned in the following manner,

فما لهم عن التذكرة معرضين كأنهم حمر مستنفرة فرت من قسورة بل يريد كل امرئ منهم أن يؤتى صحفاً منشرة كلا بل لا يجافون الآخرة

"Then what is wrong with them that they flee (I`raad) from the remembrance (the Qur'an) as if they were donkeys fleeing from a lion? On the contrary, every one of them wants that he should be given pages

[12] Surat ut-Tawba, ayah 65-66

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

spread out (of the revelation). By no means! On the contrary, they do not fear the Hereafter."[13]

f. **<u>`Inaad</u>**. This type of kufr is to be stubborn against Allah I and His signs and to insist on keeping others or oneself in kufr. Allah I has said,

القيا في جهنم كل كفار عنيد مناع للخير معتد مريب الذي جعل مع الله إلهاً أخر فألقيه في العذاب الشديد

"I will put in the Hellfire every stubborn (`inaad) kaafir, hindering from the good and increasing in evil and doubt, who made with Allah another god. Thus I will put him in the most severe punishment."[14]

g. **<u>Istibdaal.</u>** This is the kufr of replacing the Shari`a, and it has three manifestations, as has been listed by al `Allamah Ibrahim ibn Muhammad ibn Ibrahim[15],

[13] Surat ulMuddaththir, ayaat 49-53
[14] Surah Qaaf, ayaat 24-26
[15] This is the son of the great scholar al `Allamah Muhammad ibn Ibrahim. Most of his life, he has spent in exile and is denied his basic rights as a human being. The underground Islamic movements do not print except his books, and he is not able to leave from the Peninsula or to make contact with most of the outside world. Upon the death of his father, he was considered the most knowledgeable for the position of Mufti, but he was over ruled and removed. This particular statements of his and similar pronouncements can be found in the introduction to Tafsir Surat ulFatihah by Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhaab, p. 1-5 as well as Muhammad Nasib ar-Rifaa`ii's book of tafsir in Baab ulKufr and Baab udh-Dhunub, which is distributed in Syria, Lebanon and other places.

i. Replacing the law of Allah I with man made laws. This is where someone actually legislates a new law and attributes it to the Shari`a or he makes his own fabricated Shari`a. This example is spoken of below,

أم لهم شركآء شرعوا لهم من الدين ما لم يأذن به الله و لو لا كلمة الفصل لقضى بينهم و إن الظالمين لهم عذاب اليم

"Or do they have partners for them legislating a religion that Allah did not give permission for at all. Had it not been for the word of decision and decree, the matter between them would have been judged. And truly, for the oppressors is a torturous punishment."[16]

Allah I also asked those who want to legislate or even head for the false legislators,

أفحكم الجاهلية يبغون و من أحسن الله حكماً لقوم يوقنون

'Is it the legislation of the Jaahiliyyah (Days of Ignorance) that they seek? And who is better in judgement than Allah for a people who are certain?!'[17]

ii. Denying the law of Allah I without renouncing them. This is the equivalent of someone saying,

[16] Surat ush-Shura, ayah 21
[17] Surat ulMa'ida, ayah 50

"This particular law doesn't suit this time period, but these other laws are still satisfactory."

أ فتؤمنون ببعض الكتاب و تكفرون ببعض فما جزاء من يفعل ذلك منكم إلا خزى في الحياة الدنيا و يوم القيامة يردون إلى أشد العذاب و ما الله بغافل عما تعملون أولئك الذين اشتروا الحياة الدنيا بالآخرة فلا يخفف عنهم العذاب ولا هم ينصرون

"Is it you believe in a part of the book and you disbelieve in another part?! Then what is the reward for the one who does that except disgrace in this life and on the Day of Judgement? They will be subjected to a worse punishment and Allah is not unmindful of what you do. They are those who have purchased this life with the Hereafter. The punishment will not be lightened for them nor will they have any help."[18]

Essentially, this is disbelief in one law while believing in another.

iii. Denying the law of Allah I and renouncing them. This is when someone denies the law of Allah and fails to judge by what Allah sent down all of the time.

This third type of Istibdaal is played out in the verses where Allah I says,

[18] Surat ulBaqara, ayaat 85-86

و من لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فألئك هم الكافرون

"And whoever does not judge by what Allah sent down, then they are Kaafirun (unbelievers)."

و من لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فألئك هم الظالمون

"And whoever does not judge by what Allah sent down, then they are Zaalimun (oppressors)."

و من لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فألئك هم الفاسقون

"And whoever does not judge by what Allah sent down, then they are Faasiqun (rebellious sinners)."[19]

Looking at the evidence in front of us, if someone is ruling by the Shari`a and he should refuse to hand out a Shari`a punishment in one instance due to the fact that the guilty party is his close friend, family member, etc., this is what we call the kufr duna kufr (a kufr less than kufr), a minor kufr.

But when the person actually changes the rule, not just for that one person, but for all times to come, this is a major kufr. But if he goes and even invents a stipulation in the existing Shari`a law, this is a kufr fawqa kufr (kufr above kufr), a major kufr without doubt.

و من لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فألئك هم الكافرون

[19] These verses are located in Surat ulMa'ida, ayaat 44-47

"And whoever does not judge by what Allah sent down, then they are Kaafirun (unbelievers)."[20]

This is the completely naked and obvious kufr that is obnoxious and grotesque. This disregard for the Shari`a earns nothing but the wrath of Allah I, and it should be something that the sincere believers stay far away from.

[20] Surat ulMa'ida, ayah 44

WHAT IS TAKFIR AND WHAT ARE THE TYPES?

Now that the believers have the proper explanation of what kufr is, then it becomes necessary to study when exactly does it become the case that one can be given the title of kufr after his or her Islam. This is known as takfir. This matter is in all of the Books of Fiqh, but as we will soon come to know, not everyone understands this principle.

The main reason for the Khawaarij going astray and exaggerating in the matters of takfir was a direct result of their blending the rules of takfir together, thus it was all seen as one and the same. This major mistake must be answered and put straight, so the Ummah might not fall into confusion when we see these matters. In this section, we will lay out the different types of takfir related to our topic, starting with the first one,

1. **TAKFIR UN-NASS (charge of kufr based on a decisive text).** This is when there is a decisive text and after applying the rules of takfir, one levels the charge of kufr. An example would be where Allah I has said,

تبت يدا أبي لهب و تب

"The hands of Abu Lahab are destroyed and may he be destroyed."[21]

[21]Surat ul-Lahab, ayah 1

It is clear from this text that Allah I has thus labelled Abu Lahab, one of the uncles of the Prophet ρ who hated Islam, without doubt to be a kaafir. If someone should come and say that Abu Lahab is not a kaafir, but a Muslim, then the charge of kufr (calling someone a kaafir) can be leveled against this person. However, the impediments and rules surrounding takfir should be examined before coming to a ruling on the individual. It may be that he is a new Muslim and he doesn't know this information. It may be he is insane or something else of this nature. But the takfir should be given if the person can not be excused from the rules of takfir and no one can deny that. This is not a takfir between two people, but it is between the person and Allah I since Allah I called Abu Lahab by name.

2. **TAKFIR ULIJTIHAAD (charge of kufr based on individual judgement).** This is when a particular verse or set of verses taken from the Qur'an state an action to be kufr. An example of this would be when Allah I said in his book,

و من لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فأولئك هم الكافرون

"Whoever doesn't rule by what Allah sent down, then they are kaafirun (unbelievers)."[22]

[22]Surat ulMa'ida, ayah 44

This kufr is studied and understood. It is after all the verses related to the subject are studied carefully that one could come to a judgement and say, *'Any ruler today who is not judging by what Allah sent down is a kaafir.'* This type of takfir people could differ on because of some rules and regulations in regard to it. It could also have to do with the fact that there are different grades of kufr with regard to the topic. One grade of kufr is that one who occasionally does not judge by what Allah I sent down has not become a kaafir, but he has indeed done a major sin, a kufr duna kufr (a kufr less than kufr) as reported in an authentic narration by Ibn `Abbas τ. However, the one who makes a practice of it all the time has most certainly done kufr and is a kaafir according to another relation of Ibn `Abbas τ and that of Ibn Mas`ud τ.

3. **TAKFIR ALMU`AYYIN (charge of kufr where the individual is actually named).** The manifestation of this charge of kufr is where an actual person is named with the title of kufr. However, before this can happen, the takfir of ijtihaad must be exercised. If we relate this to the same topic mentioned above regarding ruling by what Allah I sent down, namely being, *"Whoever does not judge by what Allah sent down, then he is a kaafir,"* the judgement in ijtihaad will of course remain the same. If the ijtihaad has been made, and it is found that major kufr is involved, the next thing is that it must be double- checked to make sure that the verses from the Qur'an and the charge of kufr fits the person.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

He (the one making the charge of takfir) then next applies it to a person, for example by saying, "President Q or King Y is a kaafir because of this verse or these verses, due to the fact that he is ruling by other than what Allah sent down." Due to the fact that mu`ayyin in takfir is arrived at by ijtihaad, there could be some difference in it between one scholar and another. An example would be ta'wil (interpretation), where one scholar might pardon the individual under examination from takfir due to lack of knowledge and understanding of the evidence on the part of the one under suspicion. Some will not pardon him, like in the case of the debate between Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله and Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله, where Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله labelled the one who leaves prayer in totality to be a kaafir. With this kind of takfir, others may act on it and us it, but sometimes others might not exercise it and pardon the one in question.

This type of difference of opinion in regards to takfir of the individual was explained by non other than Shaikh ulIslam Ahmad ibn Taymiyyah,

'Takfir, it has conditions and also it has impediments. And it cannot be applied, these conditions, for a certain person or the individual. And when we say general takfir, it does not mean we call an individual a kaafir,

unless these conditions are there, and the impediments are not there any more.' [23]

4. **TAKFIR TAA'IFAT ULKUFR (charge of takfir where a group is labelled with kufr).** Allah Y did not leave this to our ijtihaad and this is a matter of imaan and Kufr. Similar situations as these happened in the time of the Messenger of Allah ρ. When people opposed the Islam and the Muslims, although they were saying La ilaha Illallah, they were killed in front of the Messenger ρ, and their killing was blessed by the Qur'an and endorsed by the Prophet ρ. Now before we go into all of the evidences, we would like to explain some principles in regard to this topic. It should be known that Allah I has judged a human being not just by himself, but by his group. We would like the brothers and sisters to understand that Allah I has made for each person two rules with regard to his belief. One rule is the judgement concerning him as an individual. Another rule is concerning his group or the group who he or she is loyal to, moving about with, putting his energy into and consuming his time with.

These four categories of people mentioned are,

1. **A Muslim by himself and by his group as well.** These are the people who do the five pillars and they

[23] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 12, page 487-489.

believe in Islam. They obey Islam according to their ability. They also work and are loyal to a guided group. Examples are the Sahaaba ω from the immigrants and the helpers, the Muslims as individuals under the khilaafa (the Islamic governing body) who were ruling by the Shari`a, even though the Khalifa (Muslim ruler) might be doing some oppression. The Shari`a was still intact and the rights of Muslims were preserved. Since 1924, after the destruction of the khilaafa, the reality of this example has disappeared. All that is left now is the people that are doing Islam individually and those struggling and fighting to bring back the Shari`a. There are also those that help them, support them and help them, even if they can't be with them as Allah I has said,

لا يكلف الله نفساً إلا وسعها

"Allah does not make a soul responsible except for what is according to its capacity." [24]

2. **A kaafir by himself and a kaafir by his group.** The likes of these are the people who don't do the apparent of the religion, either because they are the original kuffar or they are apostates. Another example also is a person that belongs to and defends a kaafir or apostate group. An example is the

[24] Surat ulBaqara, ayah 286

Christians, Jews, fire-worshippers, deists, dualists, pantheists, atheists, agnostics and Masons in the armies of Muslim countries. This is because we class these armies as defenders of other than the Islamic Shari`a.

3. **A kaafir by himself and a Muslim by his group.** The like of whom would be a person who is showing Islam, but his heart has the kufr of hypocrisy. He is part of a guided group that is supporting Allah I, His Messenger and the believers. However, he deceives that group and is looking for chances to destroy it form the inside, all the while he has the apparent `ibaadah (worship). This is just to be saved and to continue on, like `Abdullah ibn Ubai ibn Sulul in the time of the Messenger ρ and those like him. The examples of this in our time are the spies who work for apostate governments and go to the front line to spy on the Mujaahidin. They also join study circles and meetings. They are to be left to Allah I until He exposes what they are doing then they can be dealt with Islamically according to the evidence.

4. **A Muslim by himself and a kaafir by his group.** This needs to be explained further, and if not handled appropriately, it can be abused. This abuse is a usual occurrence with the Khawaarij, Takfiriyyah and the Murji'a. This situation is not new to the Ummah, as it existed in the time of the Messenger ρ and in the time of the Sahaaba ω when incidents of apostasy

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

occurred. It occurred as well in the times of the Tatars, when they entered the Muslim lands, and the Muslims were mixing with kuffar and vice versa. [25]

In fact, this is the situation of our Ummah right now. These kinds of Muslims might be good Muslims, as an individual with regard to worship and obligations. It could even be the case that he is doing tahajjud at night, hajj and so forth. However, he supports whoever fights the Shari`a or those who are killing the believers and preventing them from enjoining the good and forbidding the evil. He then gives his effort until a banner of apostasy or original kufr is made manifest. Such was the time of the Messenger ρ, when he took the believers to fight the people of Ta'if, who used to trade with Riba (usury) after their Islam. Once the Messenger ρ prohibited them, they resorted to the sword and they insisted on dealing in riba, in addition to their Islam. So the Messenger ρ fought them for 21 days, surrounded them and used the catapult to throw stones, fire and snakes at them, including their women, children, elderly and disabled as he could not see who was who and the war must go on. They were all dealt with as a group of kufr, although they used to pray, fast, and do the rest of the apparent signs of Islam.

This is also what the Qur'an has revealed concerning the Muslims who used to live among the kuffar of the

---

[25] These classifications of takfir can be found in the work, ***ad-Durar us-Sunniyyah,*** V. 9, beginning with the chapter, Hukm ulMurtadd, as well as vols. 10-11, which discuss the situation at length.

Quraish. When the Quraish were preparing for the battle of Badr, they forced the Muslims that did not make hijrah to come amongst them, just to swell their numbers to scare the Sahaaba ω and the other believers away from the battle. These people who were coerced included al`Abbas τ, the uncle of the Prophet ρ. Adding to that, the Messenger ρ told the sahaaba as mentioned in Sahih Muslim, that there are some members of Bani Haashim that will be joining the kaafir forces and they are being forced to do so. He urged the Sahaaba τ if they see any of the Bani Haashim that they don't kill them because they were forced.

Then one sahaabi from the Ansaar said, *"O, We are going to kill our families and leave our enemies and not kill them."* The Messenger ρ replied, ***"Would you like the face of my uncle al `Abbas to be slapped?"*** Then `Umar τ asked for the Messenger's ρ permission to punish the sahaabi who made such a comment. All of this would change during the war. When the battle began, some arrows from the Prophet's ρ side tore into the necks and hearts of Muslims who came amongst the people of the Quraish. The Muhaajirun ω (Emigrants) and the Ansaar (Helpers) ω at that point were terrified and shouted, *"We have killed our brothers."* Allah I then sent down these verses,

إن الذين توففاهم الملائكة ظالمي أنفسهم قالوا فيم كنتم قالوا كنا
مستضعفين في الأرض قالوا ألم تكن أرض الله واسعة فتهاجروا فيها

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

فأولئك مأواهم جهنم و ساءت مصيراً إلا المستضعفين من الرجال و
النساء و الولدان لا يستطيعون حيلة و لا يهتدون سبيلاً

"Those whom the angels take in death while they were oppressing themselves, they will say, 'What state were you in?' They will say, 'We were weak and oppressed in the earth.' They will say, 'Was not the earth of Allah spacious enough for you to make emigration in?' Their destination is the Hell fire and what an evil end. Except the truly weak and oppressed from the men and women and the one not able to devise a plan or find a way."[26][27]

Allah I then exempted the weak and disabled and their like from going into the fire if they don't emigrate. But in this story, there is something else to endorse the importance of judging the group of kufr and dealing with them. That is the strong words of the Messenger ρ to his uncle al `Abbas τ, when he was insisting to the Messenger ρ that he was Muslim to exempt him from paying the ransom for himself and his nephew. The Messenger ρ said,

"Leave that argument aside. You came with a group fighting and you are going to be dealt with as a group that fought. You must pay for yourself and your nephew."

---

[26]Surat un-Nisaa', ayah 97-98

[27]For the tafsir of the event that we mentioned, please see the Tafsir ulQur'an ul`Azim and Tafsir Jaami` ulAhkaam.

In another hadith, he ρ said,

"Your apparent is what we judge you about, and your internal is to Allah."[28]

He then ordered al `Abbas τ to pay the ransom for him and his nephew. Then Allah Y revealed with regard to that,

يا ايها النبي قل لمن في ايديكم من الاسرى إن يعلم الله في قلوبهم خيراً
يؤتكم خيراً مما أخذ منكم و يغفر لكم و الله غفور رحيم

"O Prophet! Say to whoever is in your hands, 'If Allah knows any good in your hearts, He will give you something better than what was taken from you and He will forgive you. And Allah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful.'"[29]

He paid twenty ounces of gold to him to free himself and his nephew.[30]

In relation to judging a group of kufr and a group of imaan, Allah I has spoken

[28]Please see Sahih alBukhaari in the tafsir of this verse and Kitaab alGhazwa.
[29]Surat ulAnfaal, ayah 70
[30]You can research this ayah in the tafsirs of Imaam alQurtubi, Imaam Ibn Kathir and Imaam at-Tabari

الذين أمنوا يقاتلون في سبيل الله و الذين كفروا يقاتلون في سبيل
الطاغوت فقاتلوا أولياء الشيطان إن كيد الشيطان كان ضعيفاً

"Those who are believers fight in the cause of Allah, and those who are kuffar fight in the cause of the Taghut. So fight the friends and allies of the Shaitan. Truly the plan of Shaitan is weak."[31]

This ayah has three main rules with regard to the group,

1. Those who fight in the cause of Allah I, they are in general believers, even though there may be hypocrites among them, they are still believers.

2. Those who are fighting for the benefit of an opponent to Allah I, or other than the ideology of Islam. They are a group of kufr, even if they have amongst them people who are not kuffar. As a group, they are still all a group of kufr, according to the apparent.

3. What position ***we should we take with regard to these groups. Allah I shows which group we should be linked with and which group we should fight. Allah I also orders us to fight the group according to the apparent and the fight must go on.

It is then clear that Allah I makes the reason to call a group as kufr or imaan is the motive of what the group is

[31]Surat un-Nisaa', ayah 76

fighting for in the end. If there is a group fighting to keep the law and order of Allah I intact, this is the group of imaan. The other group is the group of kufr, in which its motive is to fight in the cause of taghut. Taghut is whatever and whoever people are using to judge amongst themselves other than Allah I and are known as a group of kufr without doubt. And yet another example of Allah I labeling one group as kufr and another imaan is mentioned in the following hadith,

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الصَّبَّاحِ حَدَّثَنَا إِسْمَاعِيلُ بْنُ زَكَرِيَّاءَ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ سُوقَةَ عَنْ نَافِعِ بْنِ جُبَيْرِ بْنِ مُطْعِمٍ قَالَ حَدَّثَتْنِي عَائِشَةُ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا قَالَتْ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَغْزُو جَيْشٌ الْكَعْبَةَ فَإِذَا كَانُوا بِبَيْدَاءَ مِنْ الْأَرْضِ يُخْسَفُ بِأَوَّلِهِمْ وَآخِرِهِمْ قَالَتْ قُلْتُ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ كَيْفَ يُخْسَفُ بِأَوَّلِهِمْ وَآخِرِهِمْ وَفِيهِمْ أَسْوَاقُهُمْ وَمَنْ لَيْسَ مِنْهُمْ قَالَ يُخْسَفُ بِأَوَّلِهِمْ وَآخِرِهِمْ ثُمَّ يُبْعَثُونَ عَلَى نِيَّاتِهِمْ

It is related by `A'isha ω who said, *"The Messenger of Allah ρ said,* ***'An army will come to make war on the Ka`aba, then when they are in Baida, the Earth will swallow them up, from the first of them to the last of them.'*** *I said, 'O Messenger of Allah, how is it the first of them to the last of them will be swallowed up and they have those among them who are ***form the market and those that are not from them.' He said,* ***'The first of them to the last of them will be swallowed up, then they will be resurrected according to their intention.' "***[32]

[32] Sahih alBukhaari, hadith 1975

In the version of Imaam Ahmad, Imaam Tirmidhi and Imaam Ibn Maajah رحمهم الله, it states *'there will be forced people inside of them'*, and the Messenger ρ said that, ***"They will be resurrected according to what is inside of them."*** In the version of Nisaa'ii, it is asked, *'What if there shall be believers among them?'* Therefore we know that the army is a group of kufr, even if believers are inside of it.

Although this army is a group of kufr, each and every individual in that group cannot be called a kaafir. This is clearly the methodology of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah and what is the balance between the two extremes. ***And example of this balance is the verdict of Al `Allamah Shaikh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim Aala Shaikh (RH), who said in this regard to the takfir of a group,

"The third division is the thing that involves inner thoughts. So this does not cause a person to apostate, until the proofs have been established upon him. Regardless of whether it is in the foundations of the secondary matters. So we know from this that there is no takfir upon anyone except, the establishment of proof upon him. (There is no takfir, upon anyone, except, with the establishment of proof upon him). So the division is apparent, and the second is in it's place. In this case not the third. Then there are two things here, the ruling upon the thing that is disbelief, and the ruling upon the person specifically, is a separate

matter…Then there is the TAKFIR OF A GROUP, such as the Jahmiyyah, which is another thing," [33]

Thus in the takfir of the group, it is not the methodology of Ahl us-Sunna to make takfir on each and every one in that group, be they an army, as we mentioned above, or those that belong to a deviant group, like the Jahmiyyah, as mentioned by the Shaikh. It may be that there are those who are coerced; others are fussaaq (rebellious sinning Muslims), who want to make benefit. There could even be good believers, but believers hiding inside to help Muslims from the inside, such as Khaalid alIslaambuli رحمه الله in the Egyptian military[34] or the one from the family of the Pharaoh mentioned below,

و قال رجل مؤمن من آل فرعون يكتم إيمانه أتقتلون رجلاً أن يقول ربي الله و قد جاء كم بالبينات من ربكم

[33] Majmu`a Fataawa Shaikh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim Aala Shaikh (RH), V. 12, page 190-191. Also, please see ad-Durar us-Sunniyyah Vols. 9, 10 and 11 which deal exclusively with this subject.

[34]This man was the brother of Shaikh Muhammad Islaambuli رحمه الله, a scholar in Egypt. In the reign of Muhammad Ahmad Anwar as-Sadaat, the president of Egypt, Khaalid رحمه الله was in the military. He slowly worked his way up through the ranks, and not too long after his brother was jailed by the regime for speaking the truth, Khaalid رحمه الله assassinated Sadaat on October 6, 1981. This heroic act was carried out on television and Khaalid رحمه الله showed the entire world that enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong is still best carried out with the hand. Brother Khaalid رحمه الله was later tried by the regime and murdered in cold blood for the dirty throne of Mubaarak.

"And a believing man from the family of the Pharaoh, who hid his imaan (faith) said, 'Would you kill a man because he says, My Lord is Allah, and he has come to you with clear signs from his Lord.' " [35]

These rare elements don't change the judgement of this group as a group of kufr. Allah I did not change the judgement for the family of Pharaoh because some of them were defending Musa υ. So we can understand that it is a group of kufr fighting the Muslims and Mujaahidin in the cause of the taghut. These enemies must be fought harshly and sternly until they come back to the fold of Islam and the Shari`a of Islam. It must not rule in any matters with other than Islam, small or great. Although we don't call every individual in this group a kaafir or an apostate, we can call the high leaders of this group that make decisions Tawaaghit (false legislators). However, in reference to our population in the Muslim countries, they are weak and helpless Muslims and most of them love Allah I, the Messenger ρ and the Shari`a.[36]

[35]Surah Ghaafir, ayah 28

[36]This is an important point, due to the fact that the Takfiriyyah prefer the practice of declaring all or most of the populations of today's Muslim countries to be hypocrites and/or kuffar. These people should then ask themselves why are they calling for people to liberate the lands if they are filled with kuffar. Liberating these lands defeats the purpose if you are going to liberate apostates, which have to be killed anyway. These ideas just show that the most jaahil and deceitful of Muslims can wield authority and hold captive an audience anytime the speech is made entertaining.

From all that is above, we can understand that this is what happened for all those who were not carrying weapons and fighting Muslims. Now the situation which people are confused about now is this one. There are those people who are employed full time in the military, carrying the most sophisticated weapons against their weak and helpless brothers, most often capturing their wives and relatives to force them to hand over themselves to the Mushrikun. These Mushrikun (pagans) of course are legislating other than the Shari`a of Allah Y. Let us also understand the nature of our army, which is purely secular and anti-Islamic. It also consists of:

1. Some Muslims

2. Jews and Christians

3. Reverts from Islam or any other religion

4. Freemasons as well as freemasonry

5. Ruthless hired militia and most of the time they have no war with the Jews and Christians and have entered into indefinite treaties with them. Now their enemies are genuine Islamic movements, which makes them the real Khawaarij described in the hadith of Muslim and Bukhaari regarding those who kill the Muslims and spare the Mushrikun (pagans).

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

WHAT ARE THE IMPEDIMENTS OF TAKFIR?

Some of the rules misused by the Khawaarij and the Takfiri people led to their misguidance, as well as the others. What was their most fatal mistake is when they mistook Takfir alMu`ayyin (takfir on a particular person), Takfir UlIjtihaad (takfir based upon independent judgement) and Takfir un-Nass (takfir based on the text) and blended them into one thing. The rule of Takfir un-Nass (Takfir in which a clear text is mentioned) is a very great principle of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah and is in all of the books of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah, in addition to Shaikh ulIslam Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhaab's رحمه الله "Nawaaqid ulIslam" (What violates Islam). This rule states, ***"Anyone who doesn't declare the disbelief of the Mushrikun (pagans) or he doubts of their kufr or the truth of their thinking, it is Kufr."***

These people abused this rule blatantly and with malice. This was taken to mean that anyone who refused to declare kaafir who they THOUGHT was a kaafir is a kaafir. This case was born out when the Khawaarij declared `Ali τ and Mu`awiya τ kaafir and declared `Amr ibn al `As τ a kaafir for not declaring those two to be kuffar. This thinking is an extreme view and does not reflect the core belief of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah.

The authentic understanding of this rule is that anyone who knows those who the Qur'an and Sunna has referred to as kuffar (i.e. Jews, Christians and

Mushrikun) and refuses to label them as kuffar; or maybe even declares them Muslims, then that person is a kaafir. This same rule applies with those who declare to be Islamic such people as the Pharaoh, Abu Lahab, Jews, Christians as well as other religions after the Prophet ρ.

This is not the same as the one whose kufr is unknown to you, and a charge of kufr is made against him. No one may come to another Muslim and force him to label others as kuffar if he either has no proof or he does not know the proof of the kufr of those mentioned. Even Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhaab رحمه الله and the scholars previous to him, when they called the act kufr, every person that did the act was not declared kaafir. To apply kufr to a specific person, which is called Takfir ulMu`ayyin that has to go through specific rules and regulations according to Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah. For example, when the sahaaba τ asked the Prophet ρ to make the Dhat Anwaat, he did not call them kuffar, but he said this is equivalent to asking for a god other than Allah Y.[37] Although it was an act of kufr and blasphemy, they were not declared kuffar. This is because they only asked about it, they did not do the act. And yet another example is when Mu`aadh ibn Jabal τ came from Shaam,

[37]See the hadith in Tirmidhi, hadith 2180 and Ahmad in his Musnad, V. 5, hadith 218.

حَدَّثَنَا أَزْهَرُ بْنُ مَرْوَانَ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ زَيْدٍ عَنْ أَيُّوبَ عَنْ الْقَاسِمِ الشَّيْبَانِيِّ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ أَبِي أَوْفَى قَالَ لَمَّا قَدِمَ مُعَاذٌ مِنْ الشَّامِ سَجَدَ لِلنَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ مَا هَذَا يَا مُعَاذُ قَالَ أَتَيْتُ الشَّامَ فَوَافَقْتُهُمْ يَسْجُدُونَ لِأَسَاقِفَتِهِمْ وَبَطَارِقَتِهِمْ فَوَدِدْتُ فِي نَفْسِي أَنْ نَفْعَلَ ذَلِكَ بِكَ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَلَا تَفْعَلُوا فَإِنِّي لَوْ كُنْتُ آمِرًا أَحَدًا أَنْ يَسْجُدَ لِغَيْرِ اللَّهِ لَأَمَرْتُ الْمَرْأَةَ أَنْ تَسْجُدَ لِزَوْجِهَا وَالَّذِي نَفْسُ مُحَمَّدٍ بِيَدِهِ لَا تُؤَدِّي الْمَرْأَةُ حَقَّ رَبِّهَا حَتَّى تُؤَدِّيَ حَقَّ زَوْجِهَا وَلَوْ سَأَلَهَا نَفْسَهَا وَهِيَ عَلَى قَتَبٍ لَمْ تَمْنَعْهُ

It is narrated that when Mu`aadh ibn Jabal τ came from Shaam (the area comprising Syria, Jordan, Palestine and Lebanon today), he prostrated to the Prophet ρ. The Prophet ρ said, ***"What is this, O Mu`aadh?"*** He said, *"I came from Shaam and I observed them doing so, so I loved for myself that we should do so to you."* Then the Messenger of Allah ρ said, ***"Do not do that. Truly, if I were to order anyone that he should to other than Allah, I would have ordered that the wife prostrate to her husband. By the one in whose hand is the life of Muhammad, the woman does not love the right of her Lord, until she loves the right of her husband, even if he asks for her and she is at the oven cooking."***[38] [39]

[38] Sunan Ibn Maajah, Kitaab un-Nikaah, hadith 1843, classified sahih.

[39] Mu`aadh τ had been to the Shaam and had seen the people bowing out of respect to their bishops and their priests. Naturally, he figured, why not show this same type of respect to the Prophet ρ. This prostration was thus not one of worship, but one of respect. This is the same for the parents of Yusuf υ, who along with his brothers prostrated to the prophet υ out of respect. Of course, any one who prostrates to someone with the intention of worship of that person, of course this is major shirk and kufr without any excuse. But there is a difference to doing something from innovation and out of ignorance and doing something with intent of worship due to other than Allah I.

To distinguish in this area is paramount to understanding this great principle of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah. If there is someone who is making du`a (supplication) to Allah I at a graveyard because he believes it is a holy place, this is haraam and bid`a (innovation), but he does not leave out of the religion. But if this same person is making du`aa to the people inside of the graves, then this is major kufr with no excuse for it whatsoever. Prostrating at an area or making du`a at an area because he believes it is a holy area, again this is haraam and bid`a. But if the one mentioned is prostrating or supplicating to those at that locale, again this is major kufr.

The same is true when someone says a blasphemy because he is ignorant or has made a mistake. This one is not classed as a kaafir and out of the religion. We can see this from the following hadith qudsi,

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الصَّبَّاحِ وَزُهَيْرُ بْنُ حَرْبٍ قَالَا حَدَّثَنَا عُمَرُ بْنُ يُونُسَ حَدَّثَنَا عِكْرِمَةُ بْنُ عَمَّارٍ حَدَّثَنَا إِسْحَقُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ أَبِي طَلْحَةَ حَدَّثَنَا أَنَسُ بْنُ مَالِكٍ وَهُوَ عَمُّهُ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لَلَّهُ أَشَدُّ فَرَحًا بِتَوْبَةِ عَبْدِهِ حِينَ يَتُوبُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْ أَحَدِكُمْ كَانَ عَلَى رَاحِلَتِهِ بِأَرْضِ فَلَاةٍ فَانْفَلَتَتْ مِنْهُ وَعَلَيْهَا طَعَامُهُ وَشَرَابُهُ فَأَيِسَ مِنْهَا فَأَتَى شَجَرَةً فَاضْطَجَعَ فِي ظِلِّهَا قَدْ أَيِسَ مِنْ رَاحِلَتِهِ فَبَيْنَا هُوَ كَذَلِكَ إِذَا هُوَ بِهَا قَائِمَةً عِنْدَهُ فَأَخَذَ بِخِطَامِهَا ثُمَّ قَالَ مِنْ شِدَّةِ الْفَرَحِ اللَّهُمَّ أَنْتَ عَبْدِي وَأَنَا رَبُّكَ أَخْطَأَ مِنْ شِدَّةِ الْفَرَحِ

Anas ibn Maalik τ relates that he heard the Prophet ρ say, ***"Allah is more pleased with the repentance of his slave whenever he repents to Him than anyone of you who lost his riding animal in the desert. On the riding***

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

animal is his food, drink, so then he said from extreme pleasure, 'O Allah, you are my slave and I am your Lord!' out of a mistake from the severity of his joy."[40]

To say that Allah I is *your* slave and that you are *His* Lord is a statement of kufr, yet the man did not leave out of the religion. Why? It is because he had a slip of the tongue. This is what is known in Islam as kufr al Akhtaa' (the kufr of mistake). Someone can say this in times of extreme grief, in times of extreme joy and in times of extreme anger. At these times, for saying such a thing, the individual should not be precluded from the religion and counted as a kaafir.

From these and many other evidences, the scholars of Islam have distinguished between labelling **the act as an act of kufr and labeling the one who does it as a kaafir.** Another evidence is the hadith of the Prophet ρ about a person who was flogged after the third or the fourth time because of his alcoholism. Then one sahaabi cursed him. The Prophet ρ prohibited him from doing so, and said to him τ, ***"Don't call him that. He does love Allah and His Messenger."***[41] Although the Prophet I cursed ten activities with regard to intoxicants in general, he did not allow a person who does this activity to be cursed specifically. From these and many other evidences from the Prophet I, verses from the Qur'an and the way that the Sahaaba ω understood these verses

---

[40]Sahih Muslim, Kitaab ut-Tawba, hadith 4932
[41]Sahih alBukhaari, V. 8, hadith 771

and hadith, Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah have isolated the impediments of takfir.

These impediments are reasons from the above-mentioned sources that prevent a Muslim from being labelled as a kaafir, until the hujjah (proof) has been established on him. This is because Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah does the opposite of the Khawaarij, who consider everyone kaafir (even a Muslim) until they (the people being called kuffar) prove otherwise. We consider everyone who says they are Muslim as such until we have reason to believe otherwise. This is in accordance with what Allah I and His Messenger ρ has said. Therefore the scholars of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah are agreed upon the following impediments:

1. The action for calling him a kaafir must be undoubtedly kufr; not what people think is kufr.

2. The person must be sane.

3. The person must have knowledge or access to knowledge about the action that he does.

4. The person must have done this action deliberately

5. The person is not to be sleeping

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

6. The person chose to do the act with free will, without compulsion, and also he should not be the opposite of all the above.

7. Also, the person should not have a different interpretation, which would cause him to do the action thinking that he is pleasing Allah I. It is particularly important to make this point, due to the fact that the people doing it are interpreting. Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah does not make takfir on them, even though the act is kufr. The reason for this is that many of them are ignorant or misled by evil scholars away from the correct interpretation. Some of their leaders/scholars even lie about the Prophet ρ in giving these people their interpretation.

This is precisely why Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhaab رحمه الله, who reestablished this rule in our time, did not label the people who used to make supplication to Allah at a place called Qublat alKawwaaz as kuffar. He was keen to this situation and he changed it, because many of the evil scholars of his time invented hadith to convince people that such a bid`a is halaal.

Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله mentioned about the impediments and conditions of takfir,

'Takfir, it has conditions and also it has impediments. And it cannot be applied, these conditions, for a certain person or the individual. And when we say general takfir, it does not mean we call an individual a kaafir,

unless these conditions are there, and the impediments are not there any more.' [42]

Then the exact opposite of the above numbered impediments of takfir are:

1. The action is without any doubt kufr.

2. The person has their sanity and is well within his senses.

3. He knows the action he did and is completely aware of it.

4. He does the action purposefully, not on accident.

5. The person is awake and not sleeping.

6. The person does so, not under any coercion whatsoever.

7. The person does not have any acceptable Ta'wil[43] to justify the kufr action.[44]

Once these conditions have been fulfilled, then and only then may we level the charge of Takfir ulMu`ayyin

[42] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 12, page 487-489.
[43] Ta'wil means comprehensive explanation related to Qur'an or Sunna.
[44] More details on these points are given in our book and tapes called ***"AllahI Governance on Earth".***

(charge of kufr against the individual). In English, this can be said that,

There is a clear difference between the clear kufr and the clear kaafir. In a way, you can say, not every clear kufr is done by a kaafir. But every clear kaafir has most certainly done kufr!

In short, that is the rule.

Anything going outside of these bounds is simply **not** from **Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah.** We should take heed from the lesson that we have just learned from the disastrous behaviour of the Khawaarij.

TAKFIR AND SUSPICION TOWARDS BELIEVERS[45]

[45] For more information in this regard, please see our works, ***The Khawaarij and Jihaad*** and ***Allah Governance On Earth.***

In recent times, believers have become even more confused, as some groups of scholars and some regimes have declared democracy and Islam to be synonymous. The believers have hesitantly obeyed those in authority and have casted their votes at the ballot box, with even some of them entering into the parliaments, believing that they are enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong.

Those among the Murji'a (extremely dangerous people who tamper with the laws of Islam and try to erase them or explain them away) have rejoiced at this opportunity and have come with their mouths open to drink from the curdled milk of shirk that is being fed to them by the wet nurses of democracy. Those from among the Takfiriyyah (takfiri groups) have thrown a party, declaring the voters as well as those entering the parliament to be kuffar. This has resulted in takfir on the Indonesian people, as well as just about any other confused Muslim who may have cast his ballot for an MP or any other governmental representative. What needs to be put in perspective is the balance between these two incorrect groups based on the understanding of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah. This is necessary due to the fact the voter does not receive the exact same judgement as a ruler in certain regards, so this needs precision and elaboration. We will then split this into two matters,

a. What is the judgement on the one who enters the parliament?

b. What is the judgement on the one who is a voter or who is thinking of voting?

THE RULING REGARDING THE ONE WHO ENTERS THE PARLIAMENT

The issues regarding those who enter the parliament are one of the biggest controversies of our time and it is becoming a more heated debate with each passing day. This matter comes to us in light of the fact that in this time period there is no khilaafa and that the Muslims are no longer ruling the world with dominance. What has happened is that democracy and the kufr that surrounds it have become as inconspicuous as a black ant crawling on a black rock in the blackness of night.

When the Muslim lands were set upon in earnest in the time of Al `Allamah Muhammad ibn Ibrahim and Al

`Allamah Ahmad Shaakir رحمهما الله, the legislation of other systems and parliaments were set up and established it over the heads of the Muslims. These two scholars responded harshly to this and fought against these systems with all of the might that they had. Those in the execution of kufr and those hindering the way of Allah I were ***labelled to be a group of kufr.

However, not every single one of them is doing the kufr that removes one from the religion. They hold the same judgement as a group of kufr and they are called Mala' (chiefs of the people). This is mentioned in the Qur'an and we have made ample reference to it previously. This is what they are called whether they like it or not.

When Allah I mentions the Pharaoh and the Mala', it was the ministers, senators and the people of parliament he was making reference to ***these ayaat. Even shaikhs and knowledgeable people, when they go to the parliament, they are part of the scenario. They are either traitors, or their knowledge is not that sound when it comes to tawhid. As we see in many countries, people who have immense knowledge about hadith, fiqh, the people that narrate, when it comes to the `aqidah, they are Ash`ari[46], extreme Sufiyyah (Sufis)[47] or kuffar. This

[46] This group denies the names and attributes of Allah I, in addition to the corruption of other aspects of the religion.

[47] This group innovates things into Islam such as claiming knowledge of the unseen, practices of prayer not practiced by the Prophet ρ, in addition to claims that some of them (the sufi shaikhs) are divine or have divine

just proves being a genius in one part of knowledge does not cause you to earn another type of knowledge.

It is shocking enough to learn that even in alAzhar, they teach the Ash`ari madhhab, which is deviant in belief with regards to the names and attributes of Allah I. This group has also gone astray in many other ways of teaching, and they have presented deviant knowledge as the knowledge of Ahl us-Sunna, which is a clear falsehood. Adding to that, most of these establishments (i.e. Umm ulQurraa', Muhammad ibn Sa`ud University, Madinah University, al Azhar, etc), if not all, are just the Pharoah's establishment, which most often just give the degrees to those loyal to the Pharaoh, as is happening in Saudi, Egypt, Morocco and so on.

Thus the whole of the parliament is a group of kufr, but not everyone in the parliament is a kaafir. Thus,

1. There are those who believe in democracy as a source of legislation or an allowable legislation or they might not believe in it, but they legislate with it. These people are kuffar, no matter what other things they do. It does not matter how much worship they do or how many times they go on hajj, they cannot come an inch closer to Islam because of this action. Allah I has denounced their belief just by their existence in the

attributes. This group, as well as the previously mentioned one, is having a resurgence now. This does not mean that each and every or all Sufis are deviants, but the reference made is to those who have deviated from the straight path.

parliament, by them defending democracy and their propagating democracy.

اليوم أكملت لكم دينكم و أتممت عليكم نعمتي و رضيت لكم الإسلام ديناً

"Today I have perfected your religion for you and completed on you My favour and I am pleased with Islam as your religion."[48]

And Allah I has also said,

و من يبتغ غير الإسلام ديناً فلن يقبل منه و هو في الآخرة من الخاسرين

"And whoever chooses other than Islam as a religion, it will never be accepted from him and he will be from among the losers in the Hereafter." [49]

We emphasise again that these people are kuffar and not to be followed or accepted in any way, shape or form.

2. The second are those who are tricked or had bad interpretation given to them or introduced by themselves. They know democracy is kufr and not allowed in Islam, but they see it as a dangerous and a hazardous way to remove the Shari`a little by little, through legislation. These people then decide they want to join the legislating panel without legislating so

[48] Surat alMa'ida, ayah 3
[49] Surah Aali `Imraan, ayah 85

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

that they may stop any legislation that opposes the Shari`a.

What has happened is that these people were also given or took on a certain type of ta'wil (interpretation). The interpretation that they understood is based on two evidences. The first of those is the man who said to the Pharaoh,

و أن يك صادقاً يصبكم بعض الذي يعدكم إن الله لا يهدي و قال رجل
مؤمن من ال فرعون يكتم إيمانه أ تقتلون رجلاً أن يقول ربي الله و قد جاء
كم بالبينات من ربكم و إن يك كذاباً فعليه كذبه من هو مسرف كذاب

"And a believing man from the family of the Pharaoh who hid his faith said, 'Would you kill a man because he says, My Lord is Allah, and he has come to you with clear signs from your Lord? And if he is a liar, then his lie is upon him, and if he is truthful, then some of the disaster that he threatens you with will come to you. Truly, Allah does not guide the one who is a musrif (transgressing pagan) and a liar." [50]

Now let us try to understand this ayah. Here we have a man from the family of the Pharaoh enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong, and he is sitting on the panel of the Pharaoh. On this panel were the Pharaoh, Hamaan and Qarun (Korah). The Pharaoh was obviously the ruler and legislator, with Hamaan and Qarun being ministers in the government, thus being co-legislators. Even in spite of this fact, Allah I still called that

[50] Surah Ghaafir, ayah 28

believing man a believer, because the man was trying to enjoin the right and forbid the wrong and he wasn't legislating. But before he revealed his belief, he was in a group a kufr on the outside. Then when the revelation came, we knew that he was a believer. We use this ayah not to say that those in the group of kufr are perfect believers, but we use this ayah to show that we cannot call each and every individual in the parliament a kaafir, as the individual must be examined long before such a charge.

The man was trying to block their legislation, which was to kill Musa υ, as you can read in ayaat 24-26 in the same Surah mentioned in the footnote. This believer was doing this while on the panel with the interpretation that he could change things. This likeness would seem the same for the one that enters the parliament and he doesn't legislate. He seems to be doing the exact same thing as the believing man, although the believing man was the cousin of the Pharaoh. The one in the parliament is sitting on a panel of legislators and he is trying to block the haraam legislation.

This is why as believers, we try to use the benefit of the doubt before we jump and give a judgement. Let us not forget that Allah I called this person, one who hides his belief, a believer. What of those who announce that they are believers and democracy is kufr, and are trying to block the kufr in legislation? Shouldn't they receive more of a benefit of the doubt, although we disagree with the method and we also don't believe jihaad should

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

be delayed for one second because of the benefit of the doubt that we are giving them. This is precisely due to the fact that we know that their methodology is a dead end and orders for the Mujaahidin to stop the fitnah as in the methodology of jihaad is decisive, clear and proven to be authentic.

The next issue that they quote is an incident where when before he was commissioned with prophethood, Muhammad ρ concluded a treaty with all of the kuffar where there would be no aggression or wrong doing against anyone. This was shortly after the Prophet ρ had helped them put the Black Stone back in the Ka`aba. This treaty was called **Half ulFudul** (The alliance of Prosperity).[51] After he was commissioned by Allah I to be a prophet, Muhammad ρ continued on with the

[51] But these people should not be in charge of any fighting force, while they are in the parliament. This is because the blood of the Mujaahidin and the principle of jihaad should not be in the hands of traitors or fools. If we give them the benefit of the doubt, that does not mean that we accept them as leaders of the believers. We will tell them that the right place for them is to join the Mujaahidin. What happened in Algeria when the army leaders of the FIS who were negotiating with government is a very good example to show us that when you have lost the war, you have lost whatever gains you were going to make, and not one single kaafir law was taken back. The so-called Islamic army of the FIS handed itself over to be sorted by the government of that land for no Islamic reason whatsoever. It is a major sin for any fighter to take notice of those negotiating in the parliament. It is a different war altogether.

treaty, saying, ***"I was a part of an alliance, which I would not like to exchange for anything now."***[52]

Although this alliance was with no one but kuffar, because the outcome of it and the reason for the gathering was not contradictory to Islam, this is why the Messenger ρ endorsed it even after he was given prophethood. However, that is another interpretation, which is used by those who enter the parliament and disbelieve in democracy trying to match some outcomes that came from the treaty of the Prophet ρ. If this alliance was an act of kufr, or sitting with kuffar to judge on anything is an act of kufr, then the Messenger ρ would not have sat with them ρ. This is because all prophets are infallible from all forms of kufr and shirk, ever since they were born. So from this, we can gather that sitting with the kuffar to decide on a matter is not in and of itself kufr unless it collides with the Shari`a. Some of those who are trying to come to a decision are joining to divert the discussion towards the Shari`a. We repeat that we do not agree with this, but it is a valid interpretation to stop the foolish and crude verdict against them that they are kuffar through and through without exception.

Another way for the benefit of doubt in the matter of those interpreting is that they will argue that they are joining the parliament to tell the government that they

[52] Check the books of Sirah by Ibn Hishaam, Ibn Kathir, Ibn Ishaaq and others.

represent the majority of people. And since the government is saying that the people, living in a democracy, should be able to determine things for themselves, they (the people entering the parliament) will only say to the government only what the people want and the people want nothing but the Shari`a. Those who enter the parliament are people who want the rule to be just for Allah I. These people are attempting to embarras kufr by using their own medicine against them.

This was the case in Algeria, when the people were given a vote. And when they voted to bring in the Shari`a and demolish democracy, the false legislators were incensed. However, the election didn't work, even though 98% of the people asked for Shari`a. Allah I has told us that the only way He (Allah I) wants us to change the fitnah is by fighting, not compromising.

To emphasis the point, these people truly figure that they will enter, not make any laws, but whenever any new kufr legislation comes, they oppose it and veto it down. Although the aim is praiseworthy, it is a big haraam and major sin that they are doing.

And sometimes that haraam could also be kufr, although it starts with good intention. This is the case especially when the people who enter the parliament enjoy any privilege from joining these institutions, like receiving wages, or being given political immunity. The position they earn through this political immunity/protection in

the parliament could be major haraam or major kufr. The reason is that it could be seen as a way of allying yourselves to the kuffar. Allah I said,

و قد نزل عليكم في الكتاب أن إذا سمعتم آيات الله يكفر بها و يستهزأ بها فلا نقعدوا معهم حتى يخوضوا في حديث غيره إنكم إذا مثلهم إن الله جامع المنافقين و الكافرين في جهنم جميعاً

"And it was already revealed to you in the Book that when you hear the signs of Allah being disbelieved in or mocked at, then you are not to sit with them until they change the subject to other than that. Otherwise, you are like them. Truly, Allah will gather the hypocrites and the kuffar (unbelievers) in the fire together."[53]

Allah I in this ayah has called them kuffar and hypocrites, even though some among them are believers. They are still in the group of kufr. Those among them that are hypocrites but are judged as Muslims in this life will be with their kuffar counterparts on the Day of Judgement [54], for Allah I knew that they were

[53] Surat un-Nisaa', ayah 140

[54] Thus the judgement in this ayah cannot be used to call all of the people that enter the parlaiament as kuffar. Allah I referred to them as kuffar and hypocrites, thus there was a division made between them. Thus in this life, we see them showing Islam, but internalising nifaaq (hypocrisy), we cannot call them kuffar until the impediments of takfir are examined for such an individual. Although the judgement for this person in this life from the apparent is a Muslim, Allah I knows that this person is a hypocrite. Again, that does not stop us from classing them as a group of kufr, as legislation is kufr.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

internalising major nifaaq and their Islam was a mere show. Due to the fact that this action is actually rotating in between kufr and hypocrisy, it is better not to call every one in the parliament a kaafir. This way you give the benefit of the doubt for those who are not propagating democracy and are trying to use it to stop the propagation of kufr in legislation. Now it is important to note that it doesn't mean we agree with this method or we say it's right, for the only right method is:

قاتلوهم حتى لا تكون فتنة ويكون الدين كله لله

"And fight them till there is no more fitnah (shirk) and the religion is completely for Allah in totality."[55]

We do not suggest that we violate their blood by calling each one of them a kaafir, but they are a group of kufr. All of them, the tricked, the kuffar, the apostates, the building and otherwise are all a target that can be targeted by the believers and everyone housed under the roof of this building can be sent to Allah I (in other words killed) to be checked according to their intention.

We have to be disciplined and not use the pyramid scheme of takfir.[56] It is incumbent to draw the line of

[55] Surat ulAnfaal, ayah 39 and Surat ulBaqara, ayah 193

[56] The pyramid scheme way of making takfir is to make takfir on everyone associated with an act, which causes the domino effect. This domino effect leads to everyone being labelled a kaafir when not everyone is deserving of such a title. The model of such a takfir pyramid is as follows. The first one at the top are the rulers, in the middle are the

certainty between kuffar and Muslims, although Muslims could have munaafiqun (hypocrites), ignorant people and fools among them. It does less harm for one's Islam to include a kaafir amongst Muslims because of his hypocrisy and doubts than to call a Muslim a kaafir when he does not deserve the title and when there is not enough evidence provided [57]. This in turn does not mean that we neglect our duties to remove oppression and haraam, as the ayah quoted previously in regards to fitnah is the recipe for removing this oppression. [58]

In conclusion, there is a lot of evidence that benefit of the doubt should be given to sincere Muslims using this incorrect method. And may Allah I forgive them and show them the guidance on the right path. Those who are declaring everyone kuffar with regard to this issue,

---

scholars and the army and at the bottom are the common folk, which make up the base of the pyramid. By indiscriminately making takfir on everyone in the army and anyone in a position of authority, then the bottom, who are the common folk, suffer under the blow of 'guilt by association takfir' as well, either due to inaction or appearing to support the other parts of the pyramid. This will be tackled in the section on voting.

[57] This example could be found when the Messenger ρ knew the hypocrites by their names, but he still did not ask them to divorce their wives, even though they were known to be hypocrites by the Messenger ρ and some of the Sahaaba τ. This is due to the fact that they were within the community and the impediments of takfir could not be removed with regard to them.

[58] This matter is explained in much more detail in the work ***The Khawaarij and Jihaad***.

may Allah I guide them to focus on matters more maturely.

THE ONE THAT IS INVOLVED IN THE ACT OF VOTING

The second category that must be made mention of are those who vote. This category again is one that has led to a lot of disputation among some of Muslims of our time and has led the takfiri minded people to go on a takfir rampage in regards to voting. This has happened due to the misunderstanding of the impediments and conditions of takfir as well as the judgement on the apostate or one who disbelieves after his Islam. The one who wants to use the principles of takfir properly should first digest the chapter on what causes one to disbelieve after his imaan. Only then will the proper understanding of the religion be made known to him. Before then, the only thing the individual can do is make takfir without reason or without sufficient evidence. [59]

With regard to those that are voting, they are three main categories,

1. Those who believe in democracy and they vote and they don't mind being elected or to make laws when they have a chance. These people are apostates. But we can only know them if they speak of their belief.

2. Those who vote due to the fact that they have been given a bribe, promises due to worldly gains and so forth. These people are most likely to be fussaaq

[59] We strongly recommend that people refer to our work, ***The Khawaarij and Jihaad,*** so that they may gain more discipline in the issue of takfir.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

(rebellious sinners) due to their position hunting, who are not only selling the religion for a miserable price, but also themselves.

3. These are the Muslims who are tricked by the evil scholars; jaahil (extremely ignorant) and unknowledgeable people or spokesmen for wrong who make evil look beautiful. These people have three groups among them.

a. Those who blind follow their scholars. They know the prohibition from Allah I and we mentioned it before, '**Don't sit with people who are mocking the signs of Allah.'** These people are Mushrikun (pagans) because they have done shirk of obedience by blind following their scholars and have advanced the words of their scholars over the Book and they allow people to legislate next to the Shari`a and are assisting in shirk.

b. These are the people who have been threatened by the scholars that if they don't vote, it means that they did not enjoin the right and forbid the wrong by their tongues. They have been tricked and their voice is not being used to aid the religion of Allah I. They have been threatened that if they do not vote and select religious people to represent them in parliament, then the Shari`a will be even worse than it is now. These types of people are in error, but they are certainly not kuffar or hypocrites, due to the interpretation that they were given. May Allah I

forgive them, as they need da`awa, education and du`aa for guidance.

c. These are the people forced to vote as sometimes happens in tyrannical regimes, in particular the Middle East, as the government will stop basic needs for any citizen if he does not vote. An example will be that he will not receive any medical or other assistance if he does not produce his voting card. Some may be deprived of licenses for their businesses or travel documents for them to go outside of the country. These kinds of people are forced and Allah I will deal with them according to their intention, just how much force was applied to them and whether it was avoidable or not.

But for us to judge these people, and to judge them whether or not they had the ability to avoid this issue or not, is not fair or just in the way of Islam. However, due to all of the above, it is very inaccurate to label all voters to be kuffar, such as the Takfiriyyah or the Khawaarij, without understanding the reality of people in the absence of the Shari`a and any other alternative for those that are oppressed. Really, each case must be studied individually, if one wants to give a verdict about a certain type of people. That does not mean to delay or slow down the struggle of the Mujaahidin because some of the people have been forced or they are astray. This should not hinder the fighters of Allah I from attacking places of voting or to destroy the meetinghouses of that new bid`a known as democracy, and whoever

propagates it. But the brothers are not to target people without cause. If mistakes happen, the benefits of doubt should be given to the Mujaahidin and people should not accept any propaganda from the false legislators against those who fight in the cause of Allah I.

The Messenger ρ said,

"The best person in fitnah is a person who is riding his horse, terrorising the enemies of Allah and they are terrorising him. Second best after that is a person who lives in the mountains, worshipping Allah, and giving zakah and is waiting to die."[60]

There is no third category, therefore, those suffering, if they cannot fight, they should emigrate. We should understand that those who are fighting in the cause of Allah I, they are the fortunate and successful ones, and those who have emigrated and cleared the areas of fitnah, shirk and oppression, they are the saved ones. Those who could not do any of these two, they will be resurrected according to their intention and action but they should not be in the way or try to slow down or cancel the main struggle of ***Allah's Governance on Earth.***

[60] Related by Sahih Muslim.

TAKFIR UNLEASHED ON THE MUSLIMS OF THE WEST

AN EXAMPLE OF THE TAKFIRI METHODOLOGY

In the previous explanations, we spoke about the evil of excessive and exaggerated takfir, as well as the ideology and methodology of those who employ these tactics. We brought forward the example of one of the revivers of the takfiri movement and we gave ample examples of his tendencies. But the next example that we would like to present you with is that of a living takfiri, who is not only attempting to reinvigorate the takfiri way, but also to forge a new set of principles around his group.

The following examples will help you to observe how this takfiri has actually evolved some of his own precepts when building his empire and how he is now designing a cult above that which Shukri Ahmad and the many other Khawaarij and takfiri minded people mentioned in our book, ***the Khawaarij and Jihaad***, could not have imagined. Please read carefully and pay careful attention to the crude language and un-Islamic manners being diplayed in these segments.

‘The Devil’s Deception of the Saudi Salafis’; Side B;

“...And the verdict on the Salafis, I have given you their descriptions, I have given you their `aqidah. I will now give you the verdict. Salafis are major hypocrites (kuffar). There is no difference between a Salafi and a disciple of Musailimah. Musailimah exchanged the Shari`a, and he had people who helped him, supported him, fought for him. Salafis they will fight and kill for King Fahd who dismantled the Shariah. There is absolutely no difference between a Salafi and a disciple of Musailimah.

“Therefore you are not allowed to pray behind a Salafi. Your salaah behind them is baatil (nullified), because they are major hypocrites. They are mega hypocrites. And, now you know why I delayed this speech for four years because I make sure you can handle the verdict when I deliver the verdict on you.

“They are major hypocrites. You are not allowed to pray behind them. How can they be true believers when they take sides with people who dismantle the Shari`a, and they sell their religion, they exchange their religion, for money, pomp and glitter of the life of this world?

“And any woman who is married to a Salafi, she has to disassociate herself from him, and make baraa’ (disassociation with hate) from him. How can she cohabit with a man who betrays Allah Ta`ala, His Messenger, Al Islam, and the Muslims? She should abhor such a man! Just to look in his face should make her feel upset and sick! So how can she cohabit with a man, marry that man and cohabit with him? This is the verdict on the Saudi Salafis.”

‘The Devil’s Deception of the Murji,’ Side B.

"Another question, You've agreed with me the leaders are kaafirs for dismantling the Shari`a, and they take the U.N for their friends and allies. And they implement the resolution of the U.N, so the Iraqi children are dying by the hundreds. So they have taken sides with the Christians and Jews against Iraqi Muslims, which makes them a kaafir. And their support for the junta in Algeria, and the Christians in the Sudaan, to kill Muslims, that make them become kafirs and many things that cause the leaders to become kafirs.

"And the scholars have become kaafirs for cementing their throne. I have given you the fatwa of Ibn Taymiyyah. These were not the words of Faisal. Ibn Taymiyyah, Volume 35, page 373, and Surat ulMa'idah verse 51, ***'Whosoever you give your wa`laah to, you become that.'***

"What about the students of shaikhs like Bin Baz and Uthaimin, who go around all over the world, and get paid from the Saudi regime, and they cement the throne of the leaders, and say that what the leaders are doing is a minor kufr? Are they kaafirs as well? The Salafis I am talking to, to be more specific. Are they kaafirs as well? Now when Allah Ta`ala revealed Ma'idah 51, did Allah reveal Ma'idah 51 to scholars or to the layman? To the layman. Why did Allah reveal the ayah?

"The Muslims lost the battle of Uhud, because they disobeyed the Prophet (SAW). When they were going back to Madinah one of them said, 'When I go back to

Madinah, I want a Christian from a friend, because, if a calamity should befall us again like today, at least I have the shoulders of a Christian to lean on.' The other one said, 'I want a Jew for my friend, because, if another calamity should befall us like today, at Uhud, at least I have the shoulders of a Jew to lean on.' These were laymen, ordinary men.

"When Allah heard them speaking like this, Allah said,

" يا أيها الذين آمنوا لا تتخذوا اليهود والنصارى أولياء بعضهم أولياء
بعض ومن يتولهم منكم فإنه منهم إن الله لا يهدي القوم الظالمين"

'O you who believe don't take Christians and Jews for friends, because they are friends of each other, and if you take them for friends, you have become one of them.' [61]

"So Allah was speaking to the layman, not Scholars, a layperson, a simple person, that the moment you take kaafirs for friends, Christians and Jews, you have become one of them. So the Saudi Salafis who are vehement, and enthusiastic, in cementing the throne of the apostate leaders, they have apostated from alIslam as well. And any woman who is cohabiting with them, she is guilty of commiting zina. She is guilty of what? Adultery. It is said that many of them have apostated in Brixton. But they were told not to live in the situation.

---

[61] Surat ulMa'idah, ayah 51

And these women are cursed, because they are cohabiting with men who are the enemies of Allah Ta`ala, His Messenger, and al Islam."[62]

'Towards Liberating the Holy Lands,' Side B.

"…As the Imaam of the Prophet's Mosque, but, Alhamdulillah, he spoke out. He is not like Bin Baz who support the regime. So he is sincere, we have to make du`aa for him. And I would like to re-iterate the point that the regime is a kaafir regime. And the army who supports the regime, is a kaafir army. And the scholars who support the regime, they are kaafirs. And the Salafis who support the scholars, they are also kaafirs. And if you waver in regards to one of these, you are a Murji'.

"If you have doubts in your heart about the scholars. If you have doubts in your heart about the regime, the army who supports the regime, the scholars who support the regime and the Salafis who give their allegiance to the scholars, you are a Murji.' ***You are not of Ahl us-Sunnah WalJama`ah.***[63] *And the*

[62] And where has the proof come from such statements as these? Absolutely no regard is shown with the the chaste women who are chaste. When naming the seven most heinous sins, the Prophet (SAW) mentioned, ***Slandering chaste women, collected in Sahih ulJaami`a and classified as sahih.***

[63] Again, claiming knowledge of the unseen is a kufr. It is very dangerous to make a blanket statement of kufr on people about an issue of ijtihaad in

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

evidence for this can be found in Baqarah 166, as well as Surah 33 verse 66. That all these four categories have apostated. The evidence is what? Baqarah 166, that's one evidence. Surah Ahzaab, Surah 33, verse 66. That's another evidence. Or Surah 5, Surah Ma'idah, verse 51.

"If you give your walaa' to a Christian you become a Christian, walaa' means allegiance. If you give your walaa' to a Jew you become a Jew. If you give your walaa' to an apostate, you will become an apostate. If you give your walaa' to a hypocrite you become a hypocrite. Allah said in Surah 5 verse 51, ***'Whosoever you give your walaa' to, you have become that.'***

"So there is absolutely no doubt that all these four people, 1) the regime, 2) the army, 3) the scholars as well as 4) the Salafis, all these four, they have apostated from Al Islam. And any woman who is living with one of these men, she is not a married woman. Her marraige is not accepted. She is commiting zina (adultery). Any woman who is living with one of these men, a Salafi, a wicked scholar, a soldier in the army, or a minister in the government, she is commiting zina (adultery). She has no marriage. She has to make baraa' from such a person."

'Kufr in Perspective;' Side B;

certain matters of takfir. But this is just a simple manifestation of ignorance and crass indignation towards the common Muslim.

"So all the government scholars, who are cementing the throne of the apostate leaders, they have become apostate, ALL the government scholars. Because Abu Hanifa said, ***'If you make a du`aa, and said the leader is just, and he is an oppressor, your shahaadah is nullified.'***

"So all the government scholars, I don't even have to call names, who cement the throne of the apostate leaders, and deceive the Muslims and tell the Muslims that there is Shari`a there and the leader is just, ALL of them, their shahaadah has been nullified!! Brothers and Sisters in Islam, these are the twenty one thing that makes you become a kaafir."

'The Devil's Deception of the Murji;' Side B.

"Another question for you, now, there is the brothers, unfortunately some brothers claim that they are of the jihaad fikra (idea), Ahl us-Sunnah walJama`ah. These brothers are to be found in Tuton and Finsbury Park. They don't believe that the Salafis who are cementing the throne of the apostate leaders, they don't believe they are kaafirs. Where are these brothers found? In Tuton and in Finsbury Park.

"If you should attend a halaqah (study session) in Tuton, you will leave, you are confused. You don't know if these brothers who spoke, gave the halaqah, they are with Salafis or they are with us. All the brothers, all the brothers who have been for jihaad

training, every single one of them, are Salafi inclined. The only ones who are not Salafi inclined are the ones who went for jihaad training from this halaqah. If I am lying, please correct me now!

"ALL the brothers who have been for jihaad training, they are Salafi inclined. And some of them said they have lost their arms in jihaad and still they are Salafi inclined. Now if you were damaged, fighting jihaad, how comes you have in your heart love for the people who are cementing the throne of the apostate leaders? But I'm sure you know the hadith, ***'Three men will be drop on their faces and dumped into the Hellfire. The scholar, he seek knowledge to be called a scholar. The spender, he spent his money not to help Muslims to be called a spender, a kind-hearted. The mujaahid, he went to jihaad not to spread Islam, but to be called the lion-heart, the brave-heart, the mujaahid.'*** *These brothers they are in the third category. They are using the word jihaad for fame and fortune and to line their pockets. They are not sincere. This is why they are all Salafi inclined.*

"If they were sincere, they would hate even the shadow of a person who is cementing the throne of the apostate leader. A person who is cementing the throne of the apostate leader, if you were sincere, if you really love Allah, you'd hate even the shadow of that person. And you could never sit down in a room and eat from the same plate with that man who is cementing the throne of King Fahd, or Qaddaafi, Husni Mubarak or any

other of the apostate leaders. You can't! Your love for Allah will never allow you to do such a thing!

"Another question for you. Will Allah let the layman off on Judgement Day? You are a layman following a shaikh, a scholar a moulaana. Will Allah let you off on Judgement Day, because Allah will say, 'Well you are a layman, you're not a scholar, so I let you off'? Will Allah let you off? No. What's our evidence? Baqarah 166. Baqarah 166. ALLAH TA`ALA SAID in Baqarah 166, ***'I shall dump, the shaikh, the scholar and all of his followers in Hellfire together.'*** *So that dodgy moulaana, that evil scholar, that wicked scholar. Allah shall dump the scholar, as well as his students, together in the Hellfire. So don't think you can come on Judgement Day and say, 'O Allah, I am a layperson. I didn't go to an Islamic University. Azhar, Madinah, or Riyaadh. I didn't go there, so let me off!'*

"ALLAH SAID in Baqarah 166 to Baqarah 167, ***'I shall dump the scholars and their students together inside the Hell Fire.'*** *So don't think you can be let off! This ayah, Baqarah 166, we use it to refute the people, who let the Salafi off, claiming that they are jaahil (ignorant). So if Allah (SAW) did not let them off in Baqarah 166, who gave YOU the authority to let them off? Answer that question."*

'The Devil's Deception of the 20th Century House Niggers,' Part 1, Side A

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

"The students of these wicked scholars, who promote these wicked scholars and promote their books and promote their tapes, they are also kaafirs. And Baqarah 166 is clear evidence telling you that they are kaafirs. Because Allah said in Baqarah 166 that on Judgement Day that ***he will dump the wicked scholars and their students will follow them together into the Hell Fire…*** *"*

'The Devil's Deception of the 20th Century House Niggers,' Part 1, Side A

"Allah only let off three people. The madman, the sleeping man and the child. Only three people. Allah only let off three people. These soldiers are not mad, they are not children and they are not sleeping…"

'CIA Islam'; Side B

"Are you claiming that Allah is over-reacting? And your claiming Allah is an oppressor because he changed the Jews into apes and swine for dismantling the Shari`a and dismantling the Shari`a is a minor issue? The way hypocrites and kaafirs like Abu Usaamah, Abu Muslimah and people like Shaikh Bin Baz, alAlbaani, `Uthaimin, Hamza Yusuf. They all promote the `aqidah that to dismantle the Shari`a is a minor issue. Don't think about Shari`a, think about yourself. This is called CIA Islam, they way the CIA would like you to understand Islam."

'Devil's Deception of the Murji';' Side B

"You may think that a man has your fikrah, your`aqidah, because he makes takfir on King Fahd. He can still be a murji. If he makes takfir on Bin Baz and he doesn't make takfir on the Salafis, who are the students of Bin Baz, he is still a murji'. Did you know that? So if you want to be of US, Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah, the `aqidah of the Sahaabas, you have to make takfir on King Fahd, Bin Baz, Saudi Salafis and the army in Saudi Arabia, then you have the `AQIDAH OF THE SAHAABAS.

"But if you make takfir on King Fahd and you didn't make takfir on Bin Baz, you have nifaaq in your heart. And you have gone against the ijmaa` of the Sahaaba and the fatwa of Ibn Taymiyyah, V. 35, p. 373. And if you make takfir on King Fahd, Bin Baz but not the Salafis, you have rejected faith on Baqarah 166. Your `aqidah is still dodgy! And if you make takfir on King Fahd, Bin Baz, Saudi Salafis and you didn't make takfr on the army in Saudi Arabia, still you're a Murji.' Your `aqidah is dodgy."

OUR REPLY: THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ACT OF KUFR AND THE ONE DOING THE ACT

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

It is well known from Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah that there is a difference between the action and the one that is doing the action. And many of the statements quoted from Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah have been used out of context. An example was when Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله gave strong words in his fataawa,

*"Whenever the `aalim follows the hukm (legislation) of the ruler, and leaves off his knowledge, in contradiction to the Book of Allah and the Sunna of His Messenger, he is a kaafir (an unbeliever) and a murtadd (an apostate), who deserves to be punished in this life and the Hereafter. This rule can also be applied with regard to the group of scholars who jumped and joined the Mongols **due to fear** of them and that they wanted **to take benefit** from them. These scholars made the excuse that some of the Mongols were **speaking the Shahaada (bearing witness that Allah I was one and that Muhammad ρ was His Messenger)** and that they were Muslims."*[64] [65]

This was taken by some to mean that there is absolute takfir without doubt when someone disagrees with you and your charge of takfir against someone. It is believed by those that misuse this fatwa that those who refuse to label someone kaafir based on someone's interpretation of this fatwa are themselves kuffar. But this is simplistic rationalisation. When we see

---

It is as if he is describing our present situation today to the letter. [64]
[65] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 35, page 373

statements from Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah out of context or with merely one paragraph quoted, this does not do him justices.

For in order to understand what Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله meant by these fataawa, it is at once best to consult him on the matter. Let us look at more of Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah's رحمه الله statements,

'I have said many evidences that some actions are kufr. And because in some instances, certain groups do an action other than what he (SAW) did. But to call an individual as a kaafir who did this action or to rule that he will abide in the fire forever, this cannot be said without evidence that satisfies that statement. This is of course along with the conditions of takfir and the impediments that must be moved so that there is nothing to prevent the statements. And we generalise the statements of Allah about kufr, fisq and others. And it does not mean that the individual becomes part of that statement. We never judge the individual until the rules for that condition is met and we judge him for whatever caused him to commit that act. I have explained this rule.'[66]

He also implemented this methodology in his lifetime, when many of the scholars went to the Mongols side due to the fact that the Mongols were saying La ilaha illallah and they were Muslims. There were many

[66] Ibid., V. 28, pgs. 500-501.

scholars who supported the Mongols and we challenge the one who is misusing the fataawa of Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah to bring one statement from him were he specifically made takfir one one individual from amongst the scholars that went to the Mongols.

And infact, such a statement could not be produced when it was demanded, let alone to call the students of that scholar who changed sides kuffar or calling those who did not label the students who do not call them kuffar as kuffar. **Please show us a statement where Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah called the scholars, the students of the scholar and those who doubts in their hearts that they are kuffar to be kuffar.**

The Sahaaba did not call every single person who did not call the people who did not pay the zakaah to be kuffar, but they said in general that the people who do not pay the zakaah are a group of kufr. But when they fought them, they fought them as kuffar.

Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله also explains this in his fataawa,

"The commentary to this is that the Sahaaba have unanimously accepted and the Imaams after them to fight the people who stopped paying the Zakah, even if they pray five times and fast the month of Ramadaan. Those kinds of people had no acceptable explanation for their actions. This is why they were called apostates and fought, because they stopped paying the Zakah even if

they admit that they should pay the Zakah as Allah ordered."[67]

Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah make a difference between someone who is a deviant living amongst the Muslims or one who has sepertated himself from the Muslims physically and is isolating himself from amongst them.

We will again go to the words of Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله regarding the generalised takfir yet again,

"I am one of the most strongest amongst the people in forbidding that the individual should be named with the title due to takfir, being called a faasiq, or a disobedient one except when it is known that he has head the clear revealed hujjah (proof) established on him, in which case whoever opposes it then he becomes a kaafir, a faasiq or a disobedient one and that is made general for the sin in the issues that have been explained in word and the issues in action.

*"And the pious predecessors have always differed in much of these issues, but not one of them **ever** bore witness against the other, neither with kufr, with fisq, nor with disobedience. And I have made it clear that what has been related from the pious predecessors and the imaams is with generalisation of the statement of*

[67] Majmu` Fataawa vol.28 page 518

takfir on the one who says this and that, so it is moreoever the truth. But it is compulsory to make a difference between the general and the one that has specifically been named and this is the first issue that is disputed in by the Ummah from the large issues of the pillars. And it is the issue of the threat (of punishment from Allah).

"For indeed the texts in the Qur'an with regard to the threat (of punishment from Allah) are general in nature, like the words of His,

إن الذين يأكلون أموال اليتامى ظلماً

'Those who take the wealth of the orphans in oppression and wrong doing…'[68]

"And likewise it has been related that 'whoever does this, then he is this…' And indeed this (the statement) is general in nature and it is the place of the words said from the pious predecessors, 'Whoever said this, then he is this…' Thus it causes the individual to be scared of being in the judgment of the threat and to do repentance or good things, actions that eliminate (the previous sins) or the accepted intercession.

*"And the takfir, it is from the threats, so truly if the statement (of kufr) is a denial of what the Messenger (SAW) said, **BUT THE MAN SPOKE IT IN THE***

[68] Surat un-Nisaa, ayah 10

TIME OF ISLAM (WHEN HE WAS A MUSLIM) OR HE WAS IN THE FAR AWAY DESERT AND THINGS LIKE THIS, THEN HE DID NOT DISBELIEVE DUE TO THE DENIAL OF WHAT HE DENIED, UNTIL THE HUJJAH WAS ESTABLISHED UPON HIM. *And if the man did not hear those texts, or he heard them and they were not established on him in his sight or he went away from them and he went away from what was compulsory* ***DUE TO INTERPRETATION*** *of it. And if he is sinful, then I always mention the hadith which is in the two sahih collections of the man who said,*

'When I die, burn me, grind me into powder, then throw my ashes in the sea. For by Allah, if Allah has the ability, He would punish me with a punishment that no one had ever been punished with before from humanity.'

"So they did that to him, then Allah said, 'What caused you to do what you did?' He said, 'Fear of you!' Then He (Allah) forgave him. And this man doubted in the ability of Allah (to resurrect) and in his return when he was spread out. Quite the contrary, he had firm conviction that he would NOT return (from the dead), and this is kufr according to the consensus of the Muslims.

"But he was jaahil (grossly ignorant) and he did not know that. And he was a believer, fearing Allah that He should punish him. So He (Allah) forgave him (the man)

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

for that. And the one interpreting is from the people of ijtihaad and seeking to follow the Messenger (SAW), so it takes more precedence to have forgiveness from this example."[69]

We can then see from the other statements from Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله that his fataawa have been misused to eliminate people from the following impediments of takfir

a. Ta'wil (Interpretation)

b. Juhl (gross ignorance)

And both of these impediments Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah, including Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله, endorse. But what the person on the recorded segments is attempting to do is to eliminate the two largest components of takfir so that he may then begin to make takfir based on suspicion. This is primarily one of the worst diseases that the takfiri minded people possess.

And unfortunately, manyof the great names like the imaam above have been used as a proof to support the takfiri ideology. But these are just slanders. Another case in point is the grand imaam Shaikh Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhaab رحمه الله, who is hailed by the Khawaarij and takfiri minded to be one of their shaikhs. But the opposite will soon become apparent.

[69] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 3, pgs. 219-231.

Shaikh ulIslam Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhaab رحمه الله said about the issue to takfir with regard to ignorance and other things,

"And as far as what has been mentioned by my enemies regarding myself, that I declare as kuffar with suspicion and undue charge or that I declare as kaafir the one who is ignorant who has not had the evidence established against him, this is a tremendous lie that is being used to keep the people away from the religion of Allah and His Messenger." [70]

Thus from this fatwa of Shaikh ulIslam Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhaab رحمه الله, we know that you do not have to call someone a kaafir to be a proper Muslim. This imaam did not call everyone who was going to the graves a kaafir due to the fact that he knew that there were some who were operating under the function of ta'wil (interpretation), thus they were excused from takfir.

It is not from the core of the religion for the common Muslim to make takfir in order to be a proper Muslim. The Prophet (SAW) did not mention it when he was speaking to any of the common Muslims that they had to do this act in order to be righteous servants of Allah. And example of this is the following hadith.

[70] Majmu`a Mu'allafaat, p. 58.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

أن الأعرابي لما سأل النبي صلا الله عليه و سلم ما فرض الله علي في اليوم والليلة؟ قال خمس صلوات. قال هل علي غيرهن؟ قال لا إلا أن تتطوع. فقال الأعرابي والذي بعث بالحق! لا أزيد عليهن و لا أنقص منهن. فقال أقلح الرجل إن صدق.

A desert Arab came and asked the Prophet (SAW), 'What has Allah made compulsory on me in the night and the day?' He (SAW) said, *"Five prayers."* He (the desert Arab) said, 'Are there any more than those?' He (SAW) said, *"No, only that which you do as voluntary."* The desert Arab then said, 'By Him who sent you with the truth! I will not increase over them (the prayers) nor decrease anything from them (the prayers). He (SAW) said, *"The man is successful if he is remains truthful."*[71]

Nowhere in the text of the hadith did the Prophet (SAW) mention takfir as one of the compulsory acts that belong to the common Muslim. The desert Arab was a common Muslim that came seeking the most important compulsory acts of the religion. The answer that he was given was that which was necessary for him as a common Muslim.

To further reiterate the point that one does not need to make takfir to be a proper common Muslim is the statement of Allah,

و من يَكْفر بالطاغوت و يؤمن بالله فقد استمسك بالعروة الوثقى

[71] Related by Imaam alBukhaari in his sahih and related in alMughni, V. 1 and classified as sahih.

"And whoever disbelieves in the Taghut and believes in Allah, then he has grasped the firm hand hold." [72]

We should notice that in the Arabic text that the ayah reads,

"و من يَكْفُر بالطاغوت"(Whoever disbelieves in the Taghut), not "و من يُكفِّر بالطاغوت" (Whoever calls the Taghut a kaafir).

This is therefore showing us clearly that Allah has not ordered the common Muslim to make takfir on the Taghut. Allah ordered us to disbelieve in it and not to obey it. Allah will ask us why we did not disbelieve in the Taghut if we followed it, but Allah will not ask us, ***'Why didn't you call the Taghut a kaafir?! Why didn't you make takfir on the Taghut?!'***

This cannot be found in any of the Qur'anic narratives. Allah has not commanded for the common Muslim at any time to level the charge of takfir almu`ayyin or takfir alIjtihaad. This is due to the fact that Allah will not ask you on the day of judgement why didn't you call him a kaafir. But Allah will ask you why **DID YOU** call him a kaafir.

[72] Surat ulBaqarah, ayah 256

The forcefulness of takfir on the taped sections given is due to a lack of understanding of the proper conduct for when the SCHOLARS, not the common Muslims, come to the issue of takfir. Some important things have to be made clear before we can go further in the discussion. We would like to present to our brothers and sisters the proper conduct for when the people of knowledge come to the issue of takfir.

Proper conduct for the issue of takfir

a. The judging of an individual with kufr or levelling the charge of takfir has nothing to do with the fundamentals of the religion.

Thus from this rule, when two people of knowledge differ over the issue of the kufr of a particular individual, this should not result in one individual levelling the charge of takfir at the other or both making takfir on eachother. This is due to the fact that the charge of takfir almu`ayyin or ijtihaad is not linked with the fundamentals of the religion of either participant.

Shaikh ulIslam Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله gives us the perfect example when he speaks of that rule,

"And the pious predecessors have always differed in much of these issues, but not one of them ***ever*** *bore*

witness against the other, neither with kufr, with fisq, nor with disobedience. [73]

b. To leave a munaafiq living ***amonst the Muslims without calling him a kaafir is safer than ***labeling a Muslim who is living amongst the believers a kaafir.

And for this reason, this is why when the Prophet (SAW) knew about the hypocrites that were living amongst him, he did not order them to divorce their wives nor for their wealth to be taken. This is due to the preservation of this rule.

It is also safer to leave the takfir when there is doubt rather than to proceed to it for if the person levelling the charge was right, then he will receive his reward in the Hereafter, but if the person levelling the charge was wrong, then he has labelled a Muslim to be a kaafir and is liable to be punished in the Hereafter or the charge of kufr may come back to him and he may be judged as a kaafir, as the Prophet (SAW) said,

'Whenever a man says to his brother, O kaafir, then one of them is as one (a kaafir).' [74]

[73] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 3, pgs 219-231.
[74] Collected by the Imaams Ahmad, alBazzaar, at-Tabaraani, alBaihaqi and mentioned in the Majma` uz-Zawaa'id and Musnad Abu `Awaanah رحمهم الله.

THE ISSUE OF TAKING KAAFIR SOLDIERS FOR HELP OR THE ARMIES OF TODAY'S MUSLIM COUNTRIES

What happens if some evil Muslims use some hired kaafir soldiers? According to him, they would all be kuffar, each and every one. But this is not the way of Ahl uS=Sunna. According to Imaam Ahmad, if you use the kuffar for help, then this is dangerous to do on a regular basis. Sometimes people use this as interpretation. And this is why 90% of the people who ***di kufr, we can not call them kaafir, this is why they arent' called kuffar. They have interpreted this statement. Imaam Ahmad said in another statement it is permissible to use the kuffar. If the wrong doers break from the statement, use the kuffar to fight the state, give bai`a to them and offer them wealth, this is not allowed (he did not say it was kufr). He said that the people of truth and the `ulama would not honour such a treaty. p. 210 in Index of alMughni.

THE ISSUE OF TA'WIL (INTERPRETATION) AND JUHL (IGNORANCE) AND THE FACT OF THEM BEING IMPEDIMENTS OF TAKFIR

On the taped segments by the brother in question, the issue of ta'wil (interpretation) being from the impediments of takfir has been rejected time and time again. It has been refuted and explained by the speaker that there is no excuse for the one who makes takfir nor for the one that does certain crimes of kufr.

But this belief is wrong and without basis whatsoever. And we will give examples from the greatest imaams of Islam that ta'wil indeed is an impediment of takfir and that it is known by all of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah due to ***its' importance. This is an issue that has hindered many people from being labelled kuffar by Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah. Some of the examples quoted below may surprise you.

Shaikh ulIslam Muwaffaq ud-Din Ibn Qudaamah alMaqdisi رحمه الله says,

"That which has been agreed upon as being haraam, and well known amongst muslims, (due to the clear verses in the qur'an and the sunnah), such as eating the flesh of the pig, adultery and similar indisputable matters, he then becomes a kaafir. As we have said about the person who leaves the prayer. And if he sees as halal killing those who are protected (by the Shariah) and confiscating their property without

interpretation(ta'wil), then most scholars did not rule that they were kaafirs. Even though they are killing muslims and confiscating their property thinking this will bring them closer to AllahI, and likewise, it was not ruled that ibn Maljam was a kaafir, even though he killed the best person in his time (Imam 'Ali). Though he was seeking to become closer to AllaahI, nor were those (Khawaarij), who praised and wished they had carried out this action...and likewise this the rule in every haraam made halal, due to interpretation(ta'wil). It was narrated that a Sahaabi(Qudamah ibn Mazun), drunk alcohol(khamr), claiming it was halal, then 'Umarω, implemented the punishment(hadd), on him, without calling him a kaafir. Also abu Jandal ibn Suhail,who amongst a group of muslims, drank alcohol in Shaam(Syria), again they claimed it was halal, using the following ayat as evidence:-
(there is no harm or sin upon those who believed and did good actions in regards to whatever they consumed(ie food and drink).[75] *These people were not called kaafirs. When they knew it was haraam, they repented and the punishment was applied on them. Hence everyone, like them, should be judged in this manner, ie not be called a kaafir. Also every ignorant person, regarding a matter, which could be unknown to him, shoudn't be judged as a kaafir until he is made aware, and his doubts are cleared, if he insists (on the*

[75] Surah 5 verse 93

wrong), then he can be labelled a kaafir, but not before this.[76] *End.*[77]

Indeed, what could be more kufr than declaring the blood of Muslims to be halaal and killing them and taking their wealth? Indeed the Khawaarij did so, yet most of the Fuqahaa' did not always class them as kuffar outside of the religion, but instead it was agreed that the Khawaarij are to be fought as Khawaarij.

And the issue with Qudaamah and other people who had made alcohol halaal is well known. And they even had evidence to substantiate their position. However, `Umar did not judge them with kufr. They were asked why they did it, then they were given the hujjah (proof) that they were wrong from the Qur'an and the Sunna. In fact, `Umar said to them, *'You have sinned in the*

[76] Explanation of the Shariah to these people should be made by a recognised panel, (respected by the immediate muslim community) of trustworthy and respected muslim scholars and/or imams. It will be left to them, due to their comprehensive, in-depth knowledge of Islam, to reach a valid conclusion or verdict with regard to the issue of takfir. An individual can only advise the person concerned, ie tell them that if they persist in a particular action it could lead to kufr, but no more than this, since they do not have the authority to do so, and the means to investigate the matter adequately. As we can see in this example, the matter was taken to the highest level possible, in authority and knowledge, and they were not called kaafirs by any individual.

[77] Al Mugni vol. 10, issue 7098

ta'wil(iterpretation). In fact if you truly, feared AllahY(as mentioned in the verse they had used, Surah 5, verse 93) then you would have abstained from alcohol. Then THEY understood the proof, not that `Umarω gave them the proof and then made takfir. No, they understood the proof, where there could be no doubt in their minds.

Then after they ACCEPTED the judgement of that, they had the penalty for drunkenness enacted on them. This is why the imaam said that they had to have the doubt lifted from THEM, not someone saying that I lifted the doubt from him. To someone not interpreting, it may seem clear, but to the person interpreting it is not the same as giving him clear, convincing and relevant evidence(hujjah), which to them could be understood as no more than anbaa' (news) or matter of opinion. Judging and dealing with them after this process should be in the hands of authority ie emir, judge(qadi) or panel of scholars, or the equivalent to this.

Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله also narrated that the Sahaaba agreed to accept the opinion of imam 'Ali ibn abu Taalib which suggested that if they admitted that it is ***haeaam and a sin, they should be flogged, but if they isisted that it was halal, they should be killed.

Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله counsels us yet again on the issue of takfir and in particular the aspect of interpretation,

"And likewise it has been related that 'whoever does this,(certain actions such as ruling by other than the Shariah, spy for the kuffar, claiming khamr is halal etc.) then he is this…(judged as: fasiq, innovator, munafiq etc.)[78] *And indeed this (the statement) is general in nature and it is the place of the words said from the pious predecessors, 'Whoever said this, then he is this…' Thus it causes the individual to be scared of being in the judgment of the threat and to do repentance or good things, actions that eliminate (the previous sins) or the accepted intercession.*

"And the takfir, it is from the threats, so truly if the statement (of kufr) is a denial of what the Messenger (SAW) said, ***BUT THE MAN SPOKE IT IN THE TIME OF ISLAM (WHEN HE WAS A MUSLIM) OR HE WAS IN THE FAR AWAY DESERT AND THINGS LIKE THIS, THEN HE DID NOT DISBELIEVE DUE TO THE DENIAL OF WHAT HE DENIED, UNTIL THE HUJJAH WAS ESTABLISHED UPON HIM.*** *And if the man did not hear those texts, or he heard them and they were not established on him in his sight or he went away from them and he went away from what was compulsory* ***DUE TO INTERPRETATION*** *of it. And if he is sinful, then I always mention the hadith which is in the two sahih collections of the man who said,*

[78] Words inside the brackets are our contribution to remove ambiguity due to the difficulties of tranlation from the Arabic, to preserve the meaning.

'When I die, burn me, grind me into powder, then throw my ashes in the sea. For by Allah, if Allah has the ability, He would punish me with a punishment that no one had ever been punished with before from humanity.'

"So they did that to him, then Allah said, 'What caused you to do what you did?' He said, 'Fear of you!' Then He (Allah) forgave him. And this man doubted in the ability of Allah (to resurrect) and in his return when he was spread out. Quite the contrary, he had firm conviction that he would NOT return (from the dead), and this is kufr according to the consensus of the Muslims.

"But he was jaahil (grossly ignorant) and he did not know that. And he was a believer, fearing Allah that He should punish him. So He (Allah) forgave him (the man) for that. And the one interpreting is from the people of ijtihaad and seeking to follow the Messenger (SAW), so it takes more precedence to have forgiveness from this example."[79]

Is not denying the resurrection of Allah or the raising of the dead kufr? That is what the man did in the hadith according to Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله. What about the one ***that you give him a text and then he rejects it? Isn't he the biggest kaafir, if we follow the methodology of brother Faisal in this regard? To him

[79] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 3, pgs. 219-231.

that may be the case, but to Ahl us-Sunna it is not. Why? This is due to the fact that as Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله says,

And if the man did not hear those texts, or he heard them and they were not established on him ***IN HIS SIGHT*** *or he went away from them and he went away from what was compulsory* ***DUE TO INTERPRETATION*** *of it.*

Thus to the man interpreting, whatever texts you are bringing might not be decisive to him. The imaam did not say decisive to you, but decisive to HIM. He is the one that has to understand them and then act on them. Thus the mere presenting of some ayaat does not necessitate that he will act on them immediately, nor does it always mean that he must be labelled with kufr due to his inability due to interpretation that keeps him from acting on them.

Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله gives us yet more ***foods for thought,

****"As far as takfir, then the right and proper conduct is that whoever made ijtihaad[80] from the Ummah of Muhammad ρ, and his desire was the truth, but he made an error, he doesn't become a kaafir. Instead his error will be forgiven. However, whoever was clear about*

[80] Ijtihaad is one's best effort to establish what AllahY wants to be understood and implemented from the verses, regarding any issue.

what was revealed to the Messengerρ, and then he opposes the Messengerρ and follows other than the path of the believers, then he is a kaafir.

"And whoever followed his whims, and he fell short in seeking the truth, and he spoke without knowledge, then he is disobedient and sinful, and he could be rebellious. Also he could have good deeds that will outweigh his bad ones.
Therefore, takfir differs according to the differences in the circumstances of the person, ie not every mistaken person, neither an innovator, ignorant, nor misguided becomes a kaafir."[81]

Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله then finishes with one last statement on the issue of interpretation and takfir,

"Indeed we, after knowledge of what the Messenger came with, know by necessity that he did not legislate for his Ummah that they call on anyone from the dead, nor the prophets, nor the pious people or other than them. Nor did he leave any word or statement of seeking help from them or other than that.

"Nor did he leave any statement of seeking refuge in them or other than that, just as the fact that he (SAW) did not legislate for his Ummah prostration to the dead,

[81] Summary and quotations from Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 12, p. 180.

*nor to other than the dead or anything like that. But we know that he (SAW) ***forbid from all of ***this matters and that that is from shirk which Allah Ta`alaa and His Messenger have made haraam.*

****"But due to the presence of* ***juhl (gross ignorance) and lack of knowledge*** *of the statements of the message revealed amongst much of the latter generations, it is* ***not possible*** *to make takfir on them due to that, until it is made clear to them about that which the Messenger (SAW) came with, from that whicho opposes it."*[82]

Shaikh ulIslam Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhaab رحمه اللهwent through this same phenomenon with the grave worshippers of his time. It was said of him by his children and descendants,

"Already he established this (the excuse of ignorance) and made it clear with the agreement of the `ulama of the Ummah and the counselling with them. And he did not make takfir except after the hujjah (proof) was established and the proof was made clear and manifest. He رحمه الله even ceased in the takfir on the ignorant one from amongst the grave worshippers when it was not easy for him to make him (the person) discern that (the act he was doing was haraam)."[83]

We ask the Muslims who read of this, what could be a clearer kufr than to go to the graves and worship, or to

[82] Ar-Radd `alaal Kubraa, p. 376.
[83] Misbaah uz-Zullaam fir-Radd, pgs. 324-325.

bow down to other human beings? What of calling on the dead, asking them for help, seeking refuge in them or taking befit from calling on them or receiving payment for entrance into their shrine like graves?
But what we are reading from Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah is that at some points the people who do these acts can be excused due to the impediment of ignorance, or interpretation. SubhaanAllah! Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله at one point even said that it is **'not possible'** to make takfir on the person! Why? It was due to the impediment of juhl (ignorance) and ta'wil (interpretation), which as we have seen by now are both from the way of Ahl us-Sunna in the matter of takfir.

How many times ***have their been in history where someone has said clear kufr has been excused due to the `ulama seeing his, her or their sincerity. A clear example is the story of alHallaaj ibn Yusuf. He was a scholar of his time and at the forefront of one of the Islamic spirituality movements. However, he was taking from some scholars who were teaching him very disparaging ideas.

At one point, due to what he had been taught, and according to some scholars they say he was insane, he came to the people and declared *'Anal Haqq [I am the Ultimate Truth (Allah)]!'* He was brought to a tribunal and then crucified for that statement. But the `ulama differ over the death. An example was Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله and what he said of him,

"And there has already been groups of the people of bid`a and heretical people that have claimed allegiance to them (the Sufiyyah), but those who investigate about the people of Tasawwuf find that they (the people of innovation) are not from them (the Sufiyyah), like alHallaaj for instance.

"So indeed, most of the Shaikhs of the path (of Tasawwuf) repudiate him (alHallaaj) and eject him from the path, such as alJunaid, a master of the path (of Tasawwuf) and other than him just as that has been mentioned by Shaikh Abu `Abdur-Rahmaan as-Salami in Tabaqaat as-Sufiyyah and alHaafiz Abu Bakr alKhatib in his Taarikhu Baghdaad."[84]

But Imaam Muwaffaq ud-Din, Imaam Ibn alJawzi, Imaam alHaraawi and Imaam Ibn `Aqil رحمهم الله excused him due to partial insanity and that he was interpreting. They decided to excuse him due to the fact that they saw him to be a sincere imaam that had been mistaken. This is how takfir can sometimes be. It is difficult to assess matters in the issue of an individual that has done kufr and sometimes the issue of ignorance or interpretation might be seen by some scholars to be valid and for others not to be.

The same is true for the case of the Imaams `Ali bin Hussain ibn Sina, Imaam Ibn Rushd, Imaam az-

[84] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 11, Kitaab ut-Tasawwuf.

Zamakhshaari, Imaam az-Zarkaashi and many others. There are wide ranging lines on whether or not the above-mentioned are classed as kuffar or not due to some of their statements or actions that they committed during their lifetimes.
But all were upon the way to condemn what sins they had and to praise them for what good they did have. Thus in the issue of Takfir alMu`ayyin, as we mentioned in the previous chapter and in our work, ***The Khawaarij and Jihaad***, there can be difference of opinion, for the conclusion comes about due to ijtihaad.

Perhaps people might be ignorant of the case of Imaam Salaah ud-Din al Ayyubi رحمه الله, who is famous as a war hero for the Muslims, but there are a few things that are not known. One of them is that at the time, he worked for the Faatimiyyah government when they were in power in Egypt. Those that do not know of the Faatimiyyah can come to know that they were a very extreme faction of the Twelver Shi`a. Infact, so fanatical were they, that out of respect for `Ali (RAA) and many of the other imaams that they venerate, they had all of their masaajid facing towards Karbala in Iraq and not Makkah.

If one goes to North Africa today and other parts of Syria, one can still see those masaajid. Imaam alAyyubi رحمه الله was however working for some of them, but he did not call all of them kuffar. And what is more important, no one called him a kaafir. This was due to the fact that his interpretation was that he could go into

the government and reform from the inside out. This was his interpretation, with which many of the `ulama took issue with, but he was never declared a kaafir.

Infact, there were even scholars in Morocco, Algeria and other areas in North Africa who pretended to be Faatimi supporters so that they might get into the government, curse the Faatimi people and rouse the populous to overthrow them. But no one called all of the scholars there kuffar, nor were they branded as traitors. For their interpretation was something that was known, not accepted, but known.

Imaam alAyyubi رحمه الله also had some errors in his creed, but this did not stop Shaikh ulIslam Muwaffaq ud-Din, Shaikh Abu `Umar and Shaikh Abu Muhammad رحمهم الله from fighting alongside him to liberate the Holy Land from the Christians. But he was still counselled behind closed doors in between battles. And the same is the case with Shaikh `Umar Mukhtaar of Libya, Shaikh `Abdul Qaadir as-Sufi of Algeria and Shaikh `Abdul Karim of the Riffiyyah movement in Morocco رحمهم الله.

These men had things in their creed that Ahl us-Sunna counselled them on, but they were largely excused due to interpretation. Likewise is the case of Imaam an-Nawawi, Imaam Ibn Hajr, Imaam Ibn Daqiq al`Eid and others رحمهم الله. But if we followed brother Faisal's advice with the machine gun takfir, there would be very few Muslims or `ulama left in the Ummah. There

would only be the Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah of the Devenant Centre in East London every weekend.

Suffice it to say, these statements and historical facts regarding ta'wil and juhl being from the impediments of takfir is a fact that is easily accessible and for the sake of brevity, we will end in the quotes and giving of examples.

THE MANNERS OF AHL US-SUNNA WALJAMA`AH WHEN DIFFERING IN TAKFIR

In recent years, we have observed that there have been debates in which one side, who would not allow any disagreement, labelled the other side to be kuffar. Thus every time there was any talk on of the subject, debate either ended in takfir or in great fitnah. This same chronic disease is exactly what the Khawaarij suffered from. If any time of difference arose regarding a principle, rather than observing the proper manners, they immediately class that person as a kaafir. We would like to present the proper way of debate and disagreement according to the principles of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah. The disagreement that we have chosen shall be the debate that occurred between Imaam al`Allamah Muhammad ibn Idris ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله and the Imaam of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah, Ahmad ibn Hanbal رحمه الله

The debate centered around the judgement pending on the person that has left the prayer in one aspect (the person has neglected one of the prayers and has not returned to it). This is one of history's great debates. In the debate, Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله took the hadith narrated in his Musnad from the Prophet ρ that, ***"Whoever leaves the prayer is a kaafir."*** Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله also quoted a similar hadith in which The Prophet ρ stated, ***"Whoever leaves the prayer, he is a mushrik (pagan)."*** This is what led him to the conclusion that the person who leaves the prayer in

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

totality is a kaafir. In answer to Ahmad ibn Hanbal رحمه الله, Imaam Muhammad ibn Idris ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله said that if he is a kaafir, how does he come back to Islam? Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله said that he should retake his shahaadah (testimony of faith for a Muslim). Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله pointed out that the person already is pronouncing the shahaada and he never denied, which means that he is therefore still a Muslim. Once the debate ended, Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله stayed convinced and steadfast on his opinion and Shaafi`ii رحمه الله on his.[85] This debate has essential things that we can learn from it, such as

[85]The reality is that the truth was with Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله who used the clear evidence that whoever leaves the prayer in totality is a kaafir. But the mistake he did was that when he was asked how does the person come back to Islam, the right reply was not given, which should have been that he should repent and start praying as his way to come to Islam. It is a very common knowledge among the scholars of Islam that whoever leaves Islam, because of one or more reasons, he can only come back to Islam by removing each and every reason that made him a subject to be an apostate. For example, the one who does not rule by the Shari`a or legislates, it is shirk and kufr. So from this, the one who does such an act is clearly a mushrik and a kaafir. To come back to Islam, he doesn't have to go to hajj, umrah or build masaajid, for this was not the reason for him to go out of Islam. He must repent, remove the kufr that he did according to his ability and never do it again. And so on and so forth for a person who left Islam, for what he did or did not do. He must repair the door that he broke when he went out of Islam. The danger is that the rulers of today are tricking us. They do all types of kufr and shirk, then when they are suspected of kufr by the common folk, they go and make umrah and return, only to be lauded with praise by the people that suspected them of kufr. This act of hajj or umrah does not remove the kufr that they did for it is not the reason that they apostated. Until they repair the reason that they apostated, then they are still judged to be in a state of apostasy.

1. The presentation of the strongest evidence is what takes precedence when it comes to matching the reality of the truth. The strongest evidence should always be followed, irrespective of the personality in question. Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله had the strongest evidence in this regard; therefore his ruling is the closest to the truth of the matter.

2. Even though they disagreed and their disagreement was in such a serious matter, never once did Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله say that because Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله disagreed with his evidence that he was kaafir. Neither did Shaikh ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله say that Shaikh Ahmad رحمه الله was a kaafir for disagreeing with the evidences that he put forward. Why is this so important? This is precisely the issue that we are faced with by some today, that when you disagree with them in a matter, they go to misusing verses from the Qur'an. It may be that they have some evidence, even though it is general. If you then disagree with the evidence that the person is quoting, they class you as kaafir.

3. Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله didn't call Imaam Ibn Hanbal رحمه الله Khawaarij because he insisted on his takfir. Neither did Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله label Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله Murji'a[86], or say that

[86]These are people who exclude action from belief, and they will insist that there is only tasdiq, which is to believe in the news. However, they will disable some verses of the Qur'an which clearly state that those who change the Shari`a are kuffar and that some types of kufr in action can

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

because you didn't call a kaafir a kaafir, then you're a kaafir. We can learn a great lesson from the wisdom exercised in this debate. This is because the takfir that was being applied was the takfir of ijtihaad of a person. The hukm is general but the conclusion and ijtihaad could vary from person to person due to the conditions and the evidence in front of the one applying the judgement.

4. The takfir of ijtihaad had been looked at by both of them. However, Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله did not feel that the verdict listed in the Qur'an fit the person who left the prayer, where Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله felt that it most certainly did. This here shows that two people may disagree in the takfir of ijtihaad, but that does not mean that some one must be Murji'a, Khawaarij, deviant or kaafir due to the disagreement. It simply means that someone either doesn't have enough evidence to come to the same ruling as the other. Or it may be the case that one person has more knowledge than the other in a particular matter, which causes him to insist on a particular ruling. This was the case with Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله, who had the most evidence and understood the reality more than Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله, even though Imaam Shaafi`ii رحمه الله is the teacher of Imaam Ibn Hanbal رحمه الله.

take someone outside of the religion and many other matters which we will try to tackle in a special research we have entitled***, The Murji'a.***

5. Disagreement in an area under debate should not cause people to accuse others of being Murji'a, Khawaarij or kuffar, for the principles being executed are the way of Ahl us-Sunna when it comes to derivation of evidence. Thus someone who is using a general ayah has no right to exclude someone who disputes with him from the religion of Islam just because of what <u>*he*</u> **THINKS** is kufr. No! This is the way of the Khawaarij. Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah, when it comes to the ways of takfir alMu`ayyin and the takfir of ijtihaad, looks at all evidence, and if there is a difference, then it is examined. That which is the most correct is implemented. However, in the takfir of an-Nass, they will never disagree, as the text is clear on that Jews and Christians are kuffar, Abu Lahab is a kaafir and so on. There is no ijtihaad in this area and difference of opinion is not allowed when Allah I has stated someone by name and explicitly in the Qur'an to be a kaafir. Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah would never differ in this area.

Interpretation is one of the largest and greatest impediments of takfir. Thus we should give people the benefit of the doubt when they have interpretation. It does not mean that we don't fight kufr and oppose it. It means that we do not class every one who disagrees with us as a kaafir.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

THE ISSUE OF THE TAKFIR AND THE SALAFI WOMEN.

What if you don't call a kaafir a kaafir, then you become a kaafir? Can we say this about the Salafis? Can we say that the wives of the salafis are kuffar women based on the taped statements previously mentioned?

We cannot say this about the Salafi women, for we cannot even class all of the Salafi men as kuffar, let alone the women. These sisters are Muslim women living among the community. They see their husbands praying fasting, crying for Allah and believing in the Messenger (SAW), but they have now been made responsible to ask their husbands what they think about the rulers, what they think about the scholars and every other thing under the seven heavens. And why? Is it because of someone who wants to control people?

When Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله debated with Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal رحمه الله, as we mentioned in the previous chapter, Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله didn't say, 'Because you don't call the person that leaves off one prayer a kaafir, you become a kaafir.' This was not said. Nor did Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله declare that Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii's رحمه الله wife had to divorce him because her husband was 'cementing the throne of the people who don't pray.'

Imaam ash-Shaafi`ii رحمه الله never said of Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal رحمه الله that he was a Khawaarij and

that his wife had divorce herself from him or that their marriage ‘wasn’t accepted’ because Imaam Ahmad رحمه الله was ‘selling his religion for a miserable price.’ These type of statements could never be found on the lips of these scholars, nor should they be found on the lips of anyone who wants to be taken seriously as a teacher to the people.

During the disagreement over whether or not to fight the people who didn’t pay zakaah as apostates or not, Abu Bakr (RAA) did not call `Umar (RAA) a munaafiq and say that he had nifaaq in his heart and that his `aqidah was *‘dodgy.’* Nor did Abu Bakr (RAA) say that `Umar’s (RAA) wife was cursed for ‘she was cohabiting with one of the enemies of Allah, His Messenger and alIslam.’

The issue of the people who abstained from paying the zakaah was a great debate, but in that debate, no one tookt to name calling to prove their point in any manner whatsoever. But whenever the people resort to tactics like these, it shows that they do not have a Shari`a position for their anger, rather it is a personal hatred that they have taken unto themselves.

In the end, the Sahaaba (RAA) then fought these men and took the women as war slaves. Some of the women were returned after the war. But this has to do with women living outside of the community. For women living in the community, this should never happen.

This was not done by Ahl us-Sunna. Muslim sisters living in the community should not be treated in that matter. We want a statement from the Sahaaba where they called the wives kuffar for the person who did not leave the Muslim who he classed as a kaafir. The Sahaaba (RAA) never did this action.

These Muslims sisters that are being called cursed and adulterous are part of the Muslim community and are preserved from being taken as war captives. It does not matter if they even married an officer in a kaafir government. As long as they are living amongst the Muslims, they are preserved in the Muslim community.

Brothers in the Hamas kill spies who are married to Muslim women and then the Hamas group gives their wives maintenance, for it is not the fault of the wives that their husbands are kuffar or deviants. The Hamas feel sorry for these sisters and have mercy on them for the terrible tragedy that has befallen them. In many instances these sisters do not know, and this is why the Mujaahidin, such as Hamas, take these issues into consideration.

And this was the methodology of the Messenger (SAW) in his time when he knew who the hypocrites were and he did not tell them to divorce their wives. Infact, he did not tell their wives that they were adulterous, nor did he say that they were cursed for they were cohabiting with the ‘enemies of Allah, His Messenger and al Islam.’ Their blood was preserved.

But again, it seems that at times brother Faisal acts in a manner as if he knows more than the Messenger (SAW), as he has constantly been in the act of evolving more ways on how to deal with the 'hypocrites.' Before, the Messenger (SAW) was only worried about what they were doing on the battlefield or to the Muslims. But now, brother Faisal is being given information about them from some unseen source when they sleep, they walk about, when they go to their wives and children and even what's in their hearts.

All of these matters belong to the unseen, so then we must either believe that the brother making these charges has some link to the unseen, which would make him a Prophet. Or we would have to believe that he is a liar and he is not to be trusted making these evil remarks against our fair and pious Muslim sisters. We must of course opt for the latter choice.

And what's worse, the speaker has overstepped his bounds with regard to slandering the chaste and pious women, for indeed Allah (SWT) has spoken about the dangers of those who take this fatal step and leave their tongues loose against these women,

والذين يرمون المحصنات ثم لم يأتوا بأربعة شهداء فاجلدوهم ثمانين جلدة و لا تقبلوا لهم شهادة ابداً و أولئك هم الفاسقون

"And those who accuse chaste women and they do not bring four witnesses, flog them with eighty lashes and

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

never accept their testimony again for they are the rebellious sinners."[87]

Thus these people are flogged due to their false testimony. And so serious is the punishment for their false testimony that Allah has promised great torment in the Hereafter for those who insist and persist on this path and do not repent,

إن الذين يرمون المحصنات الغافلات المؤمنات لعنوا في الدنيا و الآخرة و لهم عذاب عظيم يوم تشهد عليهم السنتهم و ايديهم و ارجلهم بما كانوا يعملون

"Indeed, those who accuse chaste woman who never even think of anything touching their chastity and are good believers, they are cursed in this life and in the Hearafter, and for them will be a great torment on the Day when their tongues, their hands, and their feet will bear witness against them as to what they used to do. " [88]

Then without doubt, it is the fact that those who slander these sisters who are chaste without due reason, and when they are asked to produce witnesses, they do not they are very well eligible for those ayaat and their implications. And this means that they may be eligible for punishment in the Hereafter from the Lord of Creation, unless they fall under the following category,

---

[87] Surat un-Nur, ayah 4
[88] Surat un-Nur, ayah 23-24

الا الذين تابوا من بعد ذلك و أصلحوا فإن الله غفور رحيم

"Except those who repent from after that and they reform themselves. Then Allah is Forgiving, Merciful."[89]

And may the brother rectify his behaviour before it is too late. Amin.

[89] Surat un-Nur, ayah 5

THE ISSUE OF THE PEOPLE OF TOOTING AND FINSBURY PARK AND THAT THEY ARE GOING TO THE FIRE AND THEY ARE ONLY MAKING JIHAAD FOR FAME AND FORTUNE.

'The Devil's Deception of the Murji;' Side B.

"Another question for you, now, there is the brothers, unfortunately some brothers claim that they are of the jihaad fikra (idea), Ahl us-Sunnah walJama`ah. These brothers are to be found in Tooting and Finsbury Park. They don't believe that the Salafis who are cementing the throne of the apostate leaders, they don't believe they are kaafirs. Where are these brothers found? In Tooting and in Finsbury Park.

"If you should attend a halaqah (study session) in Tooting, you will leave, you are confused. You don't know if these brothers who spoke, gave the halaqah, they are with Salafis or they are with us. All the brothers, all the brothers who have been for jihaad training, every single one of them, are Salafi inclined. The only ones who are not Salafi inclined are the ones who went for jihaad training from this halaqah. If I am lying, please correct me now!

*"**<u>ALL</u>** the brothers who have been for jihaad training, they are Salafi inclined. And some of them said they have lost their arms in jihaad and still they are Salafi inclined. Now if you were damaged, fighting jihaad, how comes you have in your heart love for the people*

*who are cementing the throne of the apostate leaders? But I'm sure you know the hadith, **'Three men will be drop on their faces and dumped into the Hellfire. The scholar, he wanted knowledge to be called a scholar. The spender, he spent his money not to help Muslims but to be called a spender, a kind-hearted. The mujaahid, he went to jihaad not to spread Islam, but to be called the lion-heart, the brave-heart, the mujaahid.'** These brothers they are in the third category. They are using the word jihaad for fame and fortune and to line their pockets. **THEY ARE NOT SINCERE, THIS IS WHY THEY ARE ALL SALAFI INCLINED.***

"If they were sincere, they would hate even the shadow of a person who is cementing the throne of the apostate leader. A person who is cementing the throne of the apostate leader, if you were sincere, if you really love Allah, you'd hate even the shadow of that person. And you could never sit down in a room and eat from the same plate with that man who is cementing the throne of King Fahd, or Qaddaafi, Husni Mubarak or any other of the apostate leaders. You can't! Your love for Allah will never allow you to do such a thing!

"Another problem with the so called Jihaadies, the fake Jihaadies found in Tooting and Finsbury Park. Where are these brothers found? In Tooting and in Finsbury Park."

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

How can he know the unseen and that they are doing this for any reason? When you begin to class people with things based on the unseen, then this is wrong, for you are claiming knowledge of the unseen. And the unseen is something that is known only to Allah, especially when it comes to the sincerity or insincerity of people, which is a matter of the heart. The scholars have stated unequivocally that whoever claims knowledge of the unseen is a Taghut. Here is a listing of how Imaam Ibn ulQayyim رحمه الله classifies the Tawaaghit (plural of Taghut)

1. Shaitan

2. The one who is worshipped and is pleased with it

3. The one who calls others to worship him

4. **THE ONE WHO CLAIMS KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNSEEN**

5. The one who rules by other than what Allah sent down [90]

Shaikh ulIslam Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhaab رحمه الله made five categories, but there was a different classification of the fifth aspect,

1. Shaitan

[90] Please see his work, Madaarij as-Saalikin for further details.

2. The one who judges by other than what Allah sent down

3. **THE ONE WHO CLAIMS TO HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNSEEN BESIDES ALLAH**

4. The one who is worshipped and is pleased with being worshipped

5. The tyrannical judge who makes changes to the judgements of Allah[91]

But what exactly is a Taghut? We will allow Imaam Ibn ulQayyim رحمه الله to answer that question for us,

"The Taghut is all of what the slave goes past his boundaries in from being worshipped, followed or obeyed."

Imaam Maalik ibn Anas proclaimed, "*The Taghut is all of what is worshipped besides Allah."*

\`Umar ibn alKhattaab (RAA) said, *"The Taghut is the Shaitan."*[92]

Please see ad-Darar us-Sunniyyah, V. 1, page 109-110

[92] The quotes from these scholars is taken from \`Ilaam ulMuwaqqi\`in, V. 1, p. 85

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

Thus to claim knowledge of the unseen is the case that the person could be claiming to be a prophet and if not, then they are a Shaitan, a liar or a Taghut, which means that they have overstepped their bounds as the creation of Allah.

At any rate, any of the above categories is a disaster for the believer to fall into, which is why it should never be the case that a believer claims knowledge of the unseen. And the believer should only speak if he is sure, but how can a believer be sure with people in the Ummah such as this fielding false information?

And to slander your brothers in Islam, then what are we to do about the situation? One who takes such an attitude with the Ummah, what can we say of them? Indeed the Prophet (SAW) spoke the truth when he said,

"The highest form of riba is for a person to leave his tongue loose for the honour of his brother."[93]

And what more dishonour is there for a believer than when his own brother levels the charge of kufr at him and casts doubt and insinuations on his Islam?!

[93] Collected by the Imaams Ibn Maajah, alHaakim and at-Tabaraani in his alAwsat

LYING ON ALLAH FOR THE LOVE OF TAKFIR

Indeed on the taped segments that have been shown, it has been claimed that Allad divided people into three categories, the Muslim, the hypocrite and the kaafir. But is this thinking sound? No. This is due to the fact that it comes from a misunderstanding of the Qur'an, which is being read by a man who is very angry with the Ummah and very angry inside. Allah did not divide people into Muslims, kuffar and hypocrites. This is not what Allah did. Allah divided people into believers, kuffar and hypocrites.

And we will give the proof on how this came to be the case. Allah begins by saying,

ألم ذلك الكتاب لا ريب فيه هدى للمتقين الذين يؤمنون بالغيب و يقيمون
الصلاة و مما رزفناهم ينفقون والذين يؤمنون بما أنزل إليك و ما أنزل من
قبلك و بالآخرة هم يوقنون أولئك على هدى من ربهم و أولئك هم المفلحون

"Alif, Laam, Mim. That is the Book, there is no doubt in it. It is a guidance for those who have piety. Those, who they believe in the unseen and they establish the prayer and from what they have been sustained with they spend, and those who believe in what was sent down to you and what was sent down from before you and they are certain of the Hereafter, these are on the guidance from their Lord. And these are the successful ones."[94]

[94] Surat ulBaqarah, ayaat 1-5

Allah in these ayaat is speaking about the believers. The words Muslimun and Muslimin have yet to appear. These ayaat are speaking about the believers only. This is all that has been mentioned, the mu'minun (believers).

Now we will look at our next set of ayaat,

إن الذين كفروا سواء عليهم أ أنذرتهم ام لم تتذرهم لا يؤمنون. ختم الله
على قلوبهم و على سمعهم و على أبصارهم غشاوة و لهم عذاب عظيم

"And those who are kuffar, it is the same for them whether you warn them or you do not warn them. They will not believe. Allah has put a seal on their hearts and on their hearing and on their sight is a covering and they have a great and severe punishment."[95]

Thus Allah (SWT) here is speaking of the kuffar without doubt. And again there has been no mention of the word Muslimun or Muslimin. These ayaat are speaking exclusively about the kuffar. And there is no doubt that can be made from that at all.

Then Allah (SWT) mentions the next category,

و من الناس من يقول امنا بالله و باليوم الآخر و ما هم بمؤمنين. يخادعون
الله و الذين امنوا. و ما يخادعون إلا انفسهم و ما يشعرون

[95] Surat ulBaqarah, ayaat 6-7

"And from humanity are those who say, 'We believer in Allah and in the Hereafter' and they are not believers. They seek to deceive Allah and those who believe. But they deceive no one but themselves and they do not perceive it."[96]

In these ayaat we have the attributes of the munaafiqun (hypocrites) being given. And these descriptions carry on until ayah 20 of the surah we are quoting. But not one place in the first 20 lines of the surah are the words Muslimun and Muslimin mentioned.

This is an important issue, for the brother in the segments insists that Allah has divided people into Muslims, kuffar and hypocrites, but this has not materialised. Allah has actually divided people into mu'minun (believers), kuffar (non-believers) and munaafiqun (hypocrites).

Infact, the word Muslim does not appear in Surat ulBaqarah except in ayaat 128, 132, 133 and 136, but these narratives are speaking of Ibrahim (AS) and Isma`il (AS), so they are unrelated to the first and second page of Surat ulBaqarah, which is being taken to mean that Allah separated humanity into Muslims, kuffar and hypocrites.

One may ask, why is this so important? But indeed this is a valid point. The reason why there is a difference

[96] Surat ulBaqarah, ayaat 8-9

between what brother Faisal said and what Allah said is due to the fact that Allah is the One that sees in the unseen, so to Him are the believers, hypocrites and kuffar laid bare. But in this life, due to the fact that we are not Allah, the hypocrites have intermingled amongst the believers, so they both have the judgement as one, Muslims.

This is why the Prophet (SAW) did not ask the women to divorce their husbands and he knew who the hypocrites were, for in this life, the hypocrites are classed as Muslims, but not believers. Thus in this life, there are only two judgements, Muslim or kaafir. But the Hereafter, which is for Allah, is the time where the three categories become present. And this has been pointed out by Imaam Ibn ulQayyim, in his work, *Siffaat ulMunaafiqin* and many other scholars already.

MOST OF THE MUSLIMS TODAY ARE KUFFAR. 95% ARE KUFFAR AND ONLY A LITTLE IS PRACTISING

'The Devil's Deception of The Murji'; Side B.

"...To leave the din than for you to come inside the din. Because when you want to come inside the din you waver. 'I have to give up Jennifer. I have to give up Heineken. I have to give up the National Lottery.' You waver to come in the din. But to leave the din it's quick, because you leave the din for desires, for evil desires! SO IT'S EASIER TO LEAVE THE DIN THAN FOR YOU TO COME INSIDE THE DIN. This is why you have more Muslims OUTSIDE the deen than you have INSIDE the din. More Muslims are not practicing. A little is practicing. Very few are practicing."

'The Devil's Deception of the Murji'; Side A.

"It was requested of me, approximately two years ago to produce this topic which we are about to hear. And the reason why the brothers and sisters, have made request of me to produce this topic is because we are about to expose a disease, a fatal disease. This disease is worse than cancer, worse than aids, worse than any disease you can think of. And unfortunately 95% of the Muslims are suffering from this disease, 95% OF THE UMMAH! So if you should go to Africa, Asia, North America, South America, the Carribbean, anywhere

you find Muslims, you'll find that that Muslim community, 95% of them are suffering from this chronic decease.

"And this decease is called irjaa', liberalism. So today's topic is, The Devil's Deception of the Murji."

How can we take people such as these even remotely serious when they lie so much and show so much hatred towards the Ummah? Takfir is used for such dirty business nowadays, that the whole of the Ummah is made to bear the brunt of the blame, as if somehow they are ALL without any faith. But how can we say this about the Ummah that Allah has had mercy on.

How can we make such bold statements against an Ummah that was the last to come, but is to be the most prominent on the Day of Resurrection? Perhaps we need to remember what our beloved Messenger said of the Ummah when he proclaimed,

إن الله تعلى قد أجاز أمتي أن تجمع على ضلالة

It is narrated from Anas ibn Maalik that the Prophet (SAW) said,

'Indeed, Allah has kept my Ummah from uniting upon error.' [97]

---

[97] Collected by Imaam Ibn Abi `Aasim

إن الله تعلى لا يجمع أمتي على ضلالة و يد الله على الجماعة

It is narrated from Ibn `Umar that the Prophet (SAW) said,

'Indeed, Allah would not unite my Ummah upon misguidance. And the hand of Allah is over the Jama`ah.' [98]

أن اهل الجنة عشرون و مائة صف هذه الأمة منها ثمانون صفا

It was explained by Imaam an-Nawawi رحمه الله in his sharh of Sahih Muslim that the Prophet (SAW) said that ***'he saw that Jannah had 120 rows of people and that 80 of them were from this Ummah (the Muslims).'*** [99]

عن عبدالله قال قال لنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أما ترضون أن تكونوا ربع أهل الجنة قال فكبرنا ثم قال أما ترضون أن تكونوا ثلث أهل الجنة قال فكبرنا ثم قال إني لأرجو أن تكونوا شطر أهل الجنة

`Abdullah ibn Mas`ud narrated that the Prophet (SAW) said,

"Would you be pleased that you are one fourth of the people of the Jannah?" He (Ibn Mas`ud) said, 'We

[98] Collected by Imaam at-Tirmidhi

[99] Sharh Sahih Muslim, V. 4. Hadith classified as sahih.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

said, Allahu Akbar!' He (SAW) said, ***"Would you pleased that you are one third of the people of the Jannah?"*** He said, 'We said, Allahu Akbar!' He said, ***"Truly, my hope is that you will be half of the people of the Jannah!"*** [100]

It is so amazing to see how Allah has blessed this Ummah with being from amongst the majority of the Jannah, yet there are people who want to destroy that and make the common Muslims responsible for takfir and every other action that is the responsibility of the scholars and people of rank in the Islamic Ummah.

But some of those who want to destroy the joy that Allah has promised most of the Ummah of the Muhammad (SAW) is a well narrated hadith that reads the following,

Abu Hurairah narrated that the Messenger of Allah (SAW) said,

"This religion will split into 73 sects, 72 in the Fire and one in the Jannah and that is the Jama`ah." [101]

It is taken by some of the people of takfir that this means most of the Ummah is going to the Fire and that only a small band of people will 'make it' to the Jannah. And usually, these groups always find a way to force the hadith to point to them.

[100] Collected by Imaam Muslim in his sahih.
[101] Collected by Imaam at-Tirmidhi and classified.

The end result is that some small bands of men become Ahl us-Sunna and the vast majority of Muslims become either apostates or complete kuffar. This is not only unbelieveable but also without any basis.

For those looking for the proper sharh (understanding) of this hadith, one should turn to the words of al `Allamah Abu Ishaaq ash-Shaatibi رحمه الله,

"It (the Jama`ah) is the as-Sawaad ul`Azam (multitude and vase majority of the Muslims) from the people of Islam. And a proof on that is the words of Abu Ghaalib when he said, 'Truly the great multitudinous majority, they are those who are safe from divisions and they are on that from the order of their religion, which is the truth.'"[102]

Thus this is the living proof of the understanding that the hadith above does not mean that most of the Ummah is going to be on deviation and in the Fire. This is ludicrous also according to another hadith,

Ibn `Abbas narrated, When the Prophet was taken up to heaven he passed by Prophets followed by their nations and he passed by Prophets followed by their groups and he passed by Prophets followed by no one until he saw a tremendous throng of people (sawad `azim) so he said: ***"Who are these?"*** and the answer was: *"These are*

[102] Al`Itisaam, V. 2, Baab us-Sabab illadhi Li Ajlihi

Musa and his nation, but raise your head and look up," whereupon the Prophet said: ***"(I raised my head and saw) a tremendous throng (sawad `azim) that had blocked up the entire firmament from this side and that!"*** And it was said: *"These are your Nation..."*[103]

And in another hadith it was stated,

"The Bani Isra'il split into 71 sects and this Ummah split into one more than them, all of them in the Fire except as-Sawaad ulA`adam (the Largest Multitude)." [104]

Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله also said of this matter,

"The statement of all of them being in the Fire except one does not mean that the most of the Ummah would not be on guidance. It is the fact that there are many sects, but all of them together cannot outnumber Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah altogether."

So when we hear these statements being made on the taped statements in contradiction with the understanding and statement of the Messenger (SAW), who do we take into our confidence, one who is so angry with the Ummah of Muhammad (SAW), that he has declared

[103] Collected by Imaam at-Tirmidhi and classified as sahih.
[104] Narrated by Ibn Abi Ghaalib and collected by Imaam alHaakim, alKhatib alBaghdaadi and alBaihaqi.

them kuffar, or the guided Messenger (SAW) who has been sent to humanity and his revelation sent to him?

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

IF YOU GIVE YOUR MONEY TO THE IMF, YOU'RE A KAAFIR.

'Kufr in Perspective,' Side B.

"If you give your money to the I.M.F., YOU'RE A KAAFIR."

What can we say of this? From 5-10% of the wealth that is taken from our paychecks in Britain in the United States goes to the UN and the IMF. Do we say that the refugees in Ruwanda, Somalia and Ethiopia are kuffar for they ate from the food of UNICEF and other UN organisations during the great famines and warfares that happened in that land?

Are we saying the Muslims that suffered in Rwanda, Somalia, and Ethiopia, of starvation are kuffar? Are we saying that the moment they put a morsel in their mouth, of food, that was given to them from the I.M.F charitable fund they become kuffar? Are we saying that they are kuffar? Does this individual know that 5% of the money that is taken from the U.S, and British taxes, from everyones taxes, is given to the I.M.F? So when people go to buy produce from the store, they become kaafir without knowing it, according to his methodology. Muslims when they buy fruit, they become kaafir without knowing it according to this man and Muslims when they go to put petroleum in their car,

they become kaafir without knowing it according to this judgement.

This is not only ludicrous, but non-sensical at any rate. The Shari`a is not all one thing. People who are lazy and do not want to learn give crude rulings, for they don't want to think. Likewise, there must be a difference between what is an emergency for the person and what is not for the person. We have to get out of the habit of acting as if we know everything and acting as if we are better than everyone else.

And this seems to be the problem with the brother in question. And it is the same issue of takfir. Is he said, that anybody who gives money to the I.M.F is a kafir.

THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A MINOR KAAFIR AND A MAJOR KAAFIR

CIA ISLAM; SIDE B

"A person is either a Muslim, a kaafir or a hypocrite. Can you say to a man, you're a kaafir, but your not really a kaafir. You're a kaafir of a lesser degree. Does that make sense (laughter from the audience)?"

Hypocrites are kuffar in the Hereafter, not in this life. He is using his own ruling to hurt people. The prophet (SAW) knew about the hypocrites but he did not ask them to divorce their wives. Why should we then try to do so in this situation? He said on another tape that if a man cohabits with his wife in the anus that he is a kaafir. This is due to his understanding of the hadith is literal from the Arabic.

Imaam Bukhaari has a chapter in his Sahih called a chapter of a Kufr duna kufr (a kufr of a lesser degree). The prophet (SAW) said that a man who cohabits with his wife during her menstruation must pay half a dinar and he said in another hadith that whoever cohabits with his wife during menstruation is a kaafir. But what is meant is a kufr of a lesser kufr.

Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah said,

'Takfir has conditions and impediments. And it cannot be applied for a certain person or individual. And when

we say that a certain thing is kufr that does not mean that we call an individual person a kaafir, unless these impediments are no longer there.' [105]

Devil's Deception of the 20th Century House Niggers, Part 1, Side B

"Anyone who listens to this tape of this man and doubt in his heart that he is a kaafir, you become a kaafir. If you listen to this person, Abu Usaamah, trying to put Islam down and Muslims down and jihaad down, and you have an atom's weight of doubt in your heart that he is a kaafir, you yourself become a kaafir."

FAISAL BEFORE TAKFIR

In all fairness, something must be said about the previous demeanour of the brother that we have made mention of as our prototype takfiri. Although now he has evolved into someone really quite different, with a great deal of hatred in his heart for others that differ with him in most issues, he did at one time have a calm side. When beginning with the issue of da`awa upon his

[105] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 12, pgs. 487-489

first arrival in London in 1991, he was indeed a man that had left Riyaad and was concerned with the issue of da`awa and helping the Ummah. He was teaching people at some different locations about Islam, prayer, fasting and other useful topics.

His humility could be seen on the Way of the Sahaaba videotape and most of his own videotaped lectures more than three years back. He was comfortable with himself as a common Muslim helping other common Muslims. He was very tolerant and merciful with other Muslims. We should even mention what he said of the Salafis up until not too long ago,

'The Way of the Sahaaba;' Tape 2; Side A

"Many of them do not know any better and they just blind follow their shaikhs. But we don't call them kuffar."

This was the type of brother that we knew. He was humble, composed and well adjusted. But then the winds of change began to blow. It had begun to circulate around that this brother was involved in some bad situations that required correction for his own well-being and the well being of others.

The brother, who at the time had met brother Abu Hamza as well as studying from brother Abu Qataadah, was taken into a quiet counsel and quietly warned to be careful of his behaviour and the things that he was

doing. He took the advice and stride and was thankful. However, this would not be the last incident. As the issue with the rulers became more and more publicised, many people outwardly just labelled them kuffar without any doubt in their heart.

But there were others that said that they were doing a minor kufr and that obedience was still due to them since they were the leaders of the Ummah. Brother Faisal was confused by these differing viewpoints. He then became more confused, which caused him to issue the statement,

The Way of the Sahaaba, Part 2, Side A

'And this is why there is no Shari`a there (Saudi Arabia). And the reason why the leader is a kaafir… And I will not make specific takfir I make general takfir.'

Thus he did not want to make takfir on King Fahd or any of the others just because of someone pushing him. He was concerned about the issue of takfir and the damage that it could do to the lives of people.

There were some from amongst those in his camp who were hungry to make takfir and they were pushing the brother to do the same thing. This resulted in his first move, where he labelled the rulers to be kuffar not long

after this statement. But the same forces that had pushed him to do that were now pushing him to call the Salafis and the scholars kuffar.

But brother Faisal relented on this, preferring not to do so. This was due to the fact that he himself was a Salafi who had trained in Riyaad as well as the fact that he used to teach and listen to lectures in the Brixton Masjid in London. But he was still being pushed, which resulted in the Salafis being labelled kuffar not long afte the release of his *'Ideological Warfare'* cassette.

On this cassette, he had mentioned the Salafis without naming them, for he had not yet reached a conclusion. Nor did he label them kuffar. He merely cursed the Sa`ud regime and chided the Salafis for their softness on the Sa`ud regime.

But then not long after would come the tape, *'The Devil's Deception of the Saudi Salafis,'* on side B, in which the following vitriolic statement was delivered,

> *"...And the verdict on the Salafis, I have given you their descriptions, I have given you their `aqidah. I will now give you the verdict. Salafis are major hypocrites (kuffar). There is no difference between a Salafi and a disciple of Musailimah. Musailimah exchanged the Shari`a, and he had people who helped him, supported him, fought for him. Salafis they will fight and kill for King Fahd who dismantled the Shariah. There is*

absolutely no difference between a Salafi and a disciple of Musailimah.

"Therefore you are not allowed to pray behind a Salafi. Your salaah behind them is baatil (nullified), because they are major hypocrites. They are mega hypocrites. And, now you know why I delayed this speech for four years because I make sure you can handle the verdict when I deliver the verdict on you.

"They are major hypocrites. You are not allowed to pray behind them. How can they be true believers when they take sides with people who dismantle the Shari`a, and they sell their religion, they exchange their religion, for money, pomp and glitter of the life of this world?

"And any woman who is married to a Salafi, she has to disassociate herself from him, and make baraa' (disassociation with hate) from him. How can she cohabit with a man who betrays Allah Ta`ala, His Messenger, Al Islam, and the Muslims? She should abhor such a man! Just to look in his face should make her feel upset and sick! So how can she cohabit with a man, marry that man and cohabit with him? This is the verdict on the Saudi Salafis."

This came due to the fact that he had also suffered a great deal from questioning the Salafi establishment. Upon playing the tapes of Abu Hamza in the Brixton

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

masjid long before his split with the Salafis, he was upbraided for playing the tapes.

When he contested to their objections, the Salafis of the masjid set him upon and his nose was broken. Some of his anger towards the Salafis comes clear on Side A of the tape where he mentions that the Salafis of Brixton break noses. It was not noses, just one, which was his alone.

Also, before the release of the tape, he had gone about with Shaikh Abu Qataada debating with the Salafis of Brixton about the issue of Tawhid alHaakimiyyah and other matters. And when asked by Abu Bilaal Phillips why he rejected the brothers of the Brixton community after being with them, brother Faisal stared out at the crowd and declared, *'You are Jews!'* Shaikh Abu Qataada was incredulous that one of his students would do such a thing.

He was asked to explain himself, in which he said that he did not really mean that they were Jews, but rather that they had Jewish qualities as the Children of Israel had before. But Shaikh Abu Qataada warned him about using general speech, as those present had thought that brother Faisal had make takfir upon the Salafis present.

The situation was rectified but relations became strained when discussing the topic that they came to debate. This was some of the beginning of some of the trouble that

had been seen in brother Faisal and general statements when others anger him. [106]

After the release of the tape, 'The Devil's Deception of the Saudi Salafis,' he had been labelled by many Salafis as Khaariji (upon the way of the Khawaarij) and other terrible things. Shaikh Abu Hamza alMasri had heard the tape but remained silent.

But then things would worsen when one of his teachers in Britain, Shaikh Abu Qataada, would have segments of the tape translated from English into Arabic by his other students. The segments that he heard outraged him. He then decided that brother Faisal had to be corrected immediately. He then put together a contigent of people, including Shaikh Abul Walid, himself and Shaikh Abu Hamza alMasri as the translator due to the Shaikh Abu Qataada's inability to speak English.

The debate was set, but Abu Hamza declined due to the fact that he believed Faisal was not yet ready for a debate of this type and that he could still be corrected privately. But the debate went on, and upon arrival, brother Faisal was strongly rebuked by Shaikh Abu Qataada and told to repent from the ideas that he had and stop being so general about the Salafis and be careful when speaking in takfir.

[106] For a full explanation of this as done by brother Faisal himself, please see the video cassette ***Are the Salafis Muslims or Not*** distributed by brother Faisal himself.

But by this time, brother Faisal was insistent upon his takfir on the rulers and all of the Salafis as well. At a few points during the lecture, brother Faisal was not translating all of what Abu Qataada was saying for much of it was contradicting and demolishing the ideas that brother Faisal was teaching his students.

But due to his takfir upon all of the Salafis as well as the rulers, Shaikh Abu Qataada asked why he did not make takfir on the Mufti of Saudi Arabia, Shaikh Bin Baz as well for his involvement in what brother Faisal called treachery. But brother Faisal refused at the time, due to the fact of his love and respect for Shaikh Bin Baz, which he showed on many occasions,

Let the Scholars Beware, Side B

'We were quoting from the sayings of the respected scholars. Shaikh Ibn Baz of Saudi Arabia…'

But Shaikh Abu Qataada pressed on. He asked why Faisal rejected the ruling of Ta'wil and Juhl (ignorance) for the Salafis and not for Shaikh Bin Baz. But when feeling cornered, brother Faisal replied in a worried tone,

'Are the Salafis Muslims or not?' Debate with Shaikh Abu Qataadah; Tape 2, Side A or the Video Cassette

"Brothers, the reason why I refuse to pronounce Bin Baz a kaafir is because it is not my policy to say that

specifically this shaikh, this shaikh is a kaafir. I will pronounce the leaders kaafir, King Fahd no problem, Qaddaaffi no problem, but for me to pronounce a shaikh kaafir, I prefer not to do so. I prefer to say that the leaders are kaafir and no one can force me to pronounce Bin Baz a kaafir. I prefer not to do so."

The end of the debate left brother Faisal a broken man in some respects, with his former teacher distancing himself from him, the Salafis sneering at him due to his terrible encounter with Abu Qataada and many other things. But Faisal was far from being finished. Those that did not understand the Arabic of the debate (his students) went away feeling the same about Faisal.

The next cassettes that came were more and more radical, each and every one coming closer and closer to takfir on the general populous of the Ummah until finally the thing most feared occurred on the cassette, 'The Devil's Deception of the Murji,' Side A, where he said,

"It was requested of me, approximately two years ago to produce this topic which we are about to hear. And the reason why the brothers and sisters, have made request of me to produce this topic is because we are about to expose a disease, a fatal disease. This disease is worse than cancer, worse than aids, worse than any disease you can think of. And unfortunately 95% of the Muslims are suffering from this disease, 95% OF THE UMMAH! So if you should go to Africa, Asia, North

America, South America, the Carribbean, anywhere you find Muslims, you'll find that that Muslim community, 95% of them are suffering from this chronic decease.

"And this decease is called irjaa', liberalism. So today's topic is, The Devil's Deception of the Murji."

And he also mentioned on Side B,

"...To leave the din than for you to come inside the din. Because when you want to come inside the din you waver. 'I have to give up Jennifer. I have to give up Heineken. I have to give up the National Lottery.' You waver to come in the din. But to leave the din it's quick, because you leave the din for desires, for evil desires! SO IT'S EASIER TO LEAVE THE DIN THAN FOR YOU TO COME INSIDE THE DIN. This is why you have more Muslims OUTSIDE the deen than you have INSIDE the din. More Muslims are not practicing. A little is practicing. Very few are practicing."

Qaadi Abu Bakr al `Arabi says,

'The ignorant and the one that does a misktake, even if he does kufr and shirk, the person that does this does not

become a kaafir or a mushrik. He will be pardoned due to his ignorance and his mistake, until clear evidence comes to him. The hujjah, which the person gets when he becomes a kaafir, is still with a good explanation that can never be disputed.'[107]

He has said in a tape, kufr in perspective, regarding Ibn Kathir's statement, It is incumbent on all Muslims to fight him by any means necessary…' this is the tafsir of ayah 51 of Surat ulMa'idah.

Explain the insertion and what has been put into the insertion. If you say that all Muslims must, then you are saying that if they do not, then you are prepared to give those Muslims titles. If you say that all Muslims must fight him, then it is preparing people who differ with you to be called kuffar by you.

[107] Muhaasin at-Tawil alQaasimi, V. 5, page 1307.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

LYING ON ALLAH AND THE CONTENTS OF THE QUR'AN

Indeed, there have been a great many lies attributed in the taped segments to Islam, but one of the worst that has ever been actually attributed from this man is the great lie that has been inflicted against Allah. This lie came in the form of the brother proclaiming,

The Devil's Deception of the Murji'; Side B

*"Another question for you. Will Allah let the layman off on Judgement Day? You are a layman following a shaikh, a scholar a moulaana. Will Allah let you off on Judgement Day, because Allah will say, 'Well you are a layman, you're not a scholar, so I let you off'? Will Allah let you off? No. What's our evidence? Baqarah 166. Baqarah 166. ALLAH TA`ALA SAID in Baqarah 166, **'I shall dump, the shaikh, the scholar and all of his followers in Hellfire together.'** So that dodgy moulaana, that evil scholar, that wicked scholar. Allah shall dump the scholar, as well as his students, together in the Hellfire. So don't think you can come on Judgement Day and say, 'O Allah, I am a layperson. I didn't go to an Islamic University. Azhar, Madinah, or Riyaadh. I didn't go there, so let me off!'*

*"ALLAH SAID in Baqarah 166 to Baqarah 167, **'I shall dump the scholars and their students together inside the Hell Fire.'** So don't think you can be let off! This ayah, Baqarah 166, we use it to refute the people,*

who let the Salafi off, claiming that they are jaahil (ignorant). So if Allah (SAW) did not let them off in Baqarah 166, who gave YOU the authority to let them off? Answer that question."

This is a gross lie! Allah said no such thing in the Arabic text of the Qur'an. Let the believer read for himself,

" إذ تبرأ الذين اتبعوا من الذين اتبعوا ورأوا العذاب وتقطعت بهم الأسباب* وقال الذين اتبعوا لو أن لنا كرة فنتبرأ منهم كما تبرأوا منا كذلك يريهم الله أعمالهم حسرات عليهم وما هم بخارجين من النار"

"When those who were followed, disown (declare themselves innocent of) those who followed (them), and they see the torment, then all their relations will be cut off from them. And those who followed will say: "If only we had one more chance to return (to the worldly life), we would disown (declare ourselves as innocent from) them as they have disowned (declared themselves as innocent from) us" Thus Allâh will show them their deeds as regrets for them And they will never get out of the Fire."[108]

How serious is this sin, for someone that actually lies against Allah?! Who would do such a thing, when Allah (SWT) has clearly proclaimed without any doubt whatsoever,

---

[108] Surat ulBaqarah, ayah 166.

توبة 31

" اتخذوا أحبارهم ورهبانهم أرباباً من دون الله والمسيح ابن مريم وما أمروا إلا ليعبدوا إلها واحداً لا إله إلا هو سبحانه عما يشركون"

They (Jews and Christians) took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allâh (by obeying them in things which they made lawful or unlawful according to their own desires without being ordered by Allâh), and (they also took as their Lord) Messiah, son of Maryam (Mary), while they (Jews and Christians) were commanded, None has the right to be worshipped but He. Praise and glory be to Him from having the partners they associate (with Him)"

CALLING IBN `ABBAS A KAAFIR AND LYING ON THE MESSENGER

‘The Devil’s Deception of the 20th Century House Niggers,’ Part 1, Side A

“The Prophet’s uncle, Al `Abbas came to fight at the battle of Badr and he was held captive. He said, ‘O Muhammad, I did not want to fight you. I was forced. I did not want to fight you. I was forced.’ The Prophet said to his uncle Abbas, ***‘We found you with the Mushrikin, the pagans, we find you among the kaafirs, so we treat you as a kaafir.’ So we will take from you the ransom money. And we shall treat you like the other kaafirs. Even though you are my uncle, I shall treat you like the other kaafirs. No favouritism, no special treatment.’***

“So are you saying that the Prophet did wrong? He found his uncle with the kaafirs coming to fight at the battle of Badr. And his uncle said, ‘O Muhammad, I didn’t want to fight, I was forced.’ And the Prophet said, ***‘We found you among a kaafir army, the army of the pagans, so we shall treat you today as a kaaafir.’***

“And this is our evidence and it is impossible for any deviant to refute any one of the evidences that we have put forward. ”

Imaam Abu Muhammad alQurtubi has mentioned this situation at length in his tafsir on the subject. What we do know of the tafsir and the tafsir of Imaam Ibn Kathir, Imaam at-Tabari and many others is that the Prophet did not say that al`Abbas was a kaafir. He did not say this at all in any way in any mannter. Insertion and distortion has been inserted into the statements of the Messenger with regard to this issue.

The strong words of the Messenger ρ to his uncle al `Abbas τ, when he was insisting to the Messenger ρ that he was Muslim to exempt him from paying the ransom for himself and his nephew were exactly,

"Leave that argument aside. You came with a group fighting and you are going to be dealt with as a group that fought. You must pay for yourself and your nephew."

In another hadith, he ρ said,

"Your apparent is what we judge you about, and your internal is to Allah."[109]

He then ordered al `Abbas τ to pay the ransom for him and his nephew. Then Allah Y revealed with regard to that,

[109]Please see Sahih alBukhaari in the tafsir of this verse and Kitaab alGhazwa.

يا ايها النبي قل لمن في ايديكم من الاسرى إن يعلم الله في قلوبهم خيراً يؤتكم خيراً مما أخذ منكم و يغفر لكم و الله غفور رحيم

"O Prophet! Say to whoever is in your hands, 'If Allah knows any good in your hearts, He will give you something better than what was taken from you and He will forgive you. And Allah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful.'"[110]

There is no such mention of al `Abbas being labelled a kaafir. There is absolutely none mentioned whatsoever. Thus the person saying this is lying against the Messenger and is a liar in this regard.

So let us contrast what the Messenger actually said to Abbas, which is,

"Leave that argument aside. You came with a group fighting and you are going to be dealt with as a group that fought. You must pay for yourself and your nephew."

In another hadith, he ρ said,

"Your apparent is what we judge you about, and your internal is to Allah,"[111]

[110]Surat ulAnfaal, ayah 70

[111]Please see Sahih alBukhaari in the tafsir of this verse and Kitaab alGhazwa.

and this is that which is in contradiction to the words put into his mouth by the speaker on the cassette,

'We found you with the Mushrikin, the pagans, we find you among the kaafirs, so we treat you as a kaafir.' So we will take from you the ransom money. And we shall treat you like the other kaafirs. Even though you are my uncle, I shall treat you like the other kaafirs. No favouritism, no special treatment.'

'We found you among a kaafir army, the army of the pagans, so we shall treat you today as a kaaafir.'

To lie about tafsir is a serious matter. And if it is not a major sin, then it is kufr to do this type of thing. This is due to the fact that the Messenger (SAW) said,

من كذب علي متعمداً فليتبوأ مقعده من النار

"Whoever says a lie against me intentionally, then let him take his place in the Fire."[112]

What do we call him? We say, May Allah guide you.

Surat ulBaqarah, ayah 143,

"We have made you a middle, balanced nation, so you should become a witness against the people. And the Messenger be a witness against you."

[112] Collected by Imaam Muslim in his sahih and mutawaatir from 65 Sahaaba with the same wording.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

FORCING THE COMMON MUSLIM TO MAKE TAKFIR AND PLAYING WITH THE WORDS OF THE AYAAT

'CIA Islam'; Side A.

"The hypocrites, they try to refute the ayah. Did you know the hypocrites try to refute it? Did you know that? They try to refute Baqarah 143, quote it. Do you know

how the hypocrites refute the ayah? They said, Allah said we are witnesses, and in the courthouse the judge and the witness are two separate people. Do you see how they use logic to refute the Qur'an? So how do you refute them now? Because if you can't refute them, you are going to begin to doubt your din. On the day of Judgement, who will judge the people of Nuh? The Muslims."

He is playing with the tafsir and the words that are mentioned in the ayah. What should we call him? May Allah give him guidance. How can we trust this man when he is playing with the tafaasir of the ayaat and changing things from their meaning.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

ANSWERING SOME DOUBTS REGARDING THE KHAWAARIJ AND JIHAAD

Upon the release of our work, ***The Khawaarij and Jihaad***, there was quite a bit of positive feedback. However, there was unfortunately also some personal hatred that was directed towards us due to some of the evidences and proofs put forward in the book. This hatred had two manifestations and reasons for it. The first reason was due to ignorance of the basic tenets and fiqh of Islam, thus when the creed and fiqh of Islam was presented, it was seen as wrong, or as if we were somehow ignorant or lacking in knowledge of some Islamic principles.

This type of unsettling ignorance is what Imaam alKhatib alBaghdaadi (RH) explained, where he said,

'To the `aalim, ignorance is seen as ignorance and to the jaahil (grossly ignorant), knowledge is seen as ignorance.'[113]

This is due to the fact that the person who is grossly ignorant does not know the proofs of the evidences behind the knowledge, so when knowledge is presented and it disagrees with his intellect, it is concluded that the knowledge must be wrong, not his own understanding. This phenomenon is what has taken place with regard to the book that was written. The explanations put forward in the book were not even reviewed or even considered in the light of the relevant evidences. Rather, due to the fact that it was seen to be colliding with the intellect, or

[113] Kitaab alFaqih walMutafaqqih, V. 1, Ch. 3.

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

what others had been led to believe, it was classed as ignorance or blameworthy knowledge.

The second issue that led to the hatred was the harbouring of pride, a trait that can destroy the imaan of any believer. Any type of pride or arrogance shown in the face of other Muslims is not just a character flaw or a part of someone, it is a disease that will have tragic consequences not just for the person who holds that attitude, but for those who follow him and for both in this life and the Hereafter. Those who genuinely did want some type of closure to all of this controversy requested that we put the points of difference into writing and then answer them, this way the controversies could be answered without argument and the people could weigh the proofs for themselves.

The points raised were two in number and we will attempt to explain them as best we can, so that, insha'allah, the doubts may be cleared and people might come to a better understanding. We will then begin with our first controversy.

The First Point of Controversy

The first point that we shall cover shall be that of a fiqh nature. In our work, from pages 42-43 in the footnote at the bottom of the page, we had the following quote,

It is important here to explain that fighting the Khawaarij is different than `Ali τ fighting Mu`awiya τ but `Ali τ fighting the Khawaarij was Ahl us-Sunna wal Jama'ah fighting the deviants. There are four differences in this matter:

1. Fighting Kuffar or deviants allows the Muslims to take as ghanima (treasure taken from war) the private property of the deviants or the Kuffar. An example of taking the private property of the Kuffar is the Prophet's ρ very attaining of two of his female companions, Safiyya and Rayhana τ. All of these women, who were originally Jewish tribeswomen, were taken after victory over the Jews had been established and their husbands, who were combatants, were killed. It is not allowed for Muslims to take Muslim women as treasure in battle as we saw from the case of the Battle of the Camel in which `A'isha τ was involved.

2. It allows fighters to run after the person who fled the battlefield from the deviants or the Kuffar to kill them. This is not allowed with regard to one group of Muslims fighting another group of Muslims,

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

as those Muslims who are being fought is to stop them from fighting any more. They are not to be fought so we may kill them.

3. The Muslims can finish off the wounded deviants if possible, which is not allowed when fighting Muslims who have transgressed certain limits. The evidence for this is where Allah I says,

فإذا لقيتم الذين كفروا فضرب الرقاب حتى إذا أثخنتموهم فشدوا الوثاق
فإما منا بعد و إما فداء حتى تضع الحرب أوزارها

***"So, when you meet those who disbelieve, strike their necks till when you have killed and wounded many of them, then bind a bond firmly on them. After that there will either be generosity or ransom, until the war lays down its burden,"* Surah Muhammad, ayah**

4. It is waajib (compulsory) for Muslims when they fight evil doers to respect their bodies, pray over them and to respect them as Muslims, whereas deviants or Kuffar don't have these considerations or benefits. The evidence for this is the events that took place immediately after the battle of Badr. This was when Abu Jahl ibn Hishaam, `Utba ibn Rabi`a, Shaiba bin Rabi`a, `Uqba ibn Abi Mu`ait, Umaiya ibn Khalaf had been killed. All of their bodies were thrown into a well except the body of Umaiya, because he was so fat. The body was pulled apart and then thrown into a well, as reported in Sahih alBukhari, V. 6. This would obviously be wrong to

perpetrate on a Muslim, but the Kuffar and deviants are open game for this type of action. This part was not part of the first edition footnote, For more information on this evidence, please see Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 28, pgs. 476-479 by Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله, who said,

***"It is narrated on the authority of `Ali τ and `Umar τ as well as the consensus of the scholars of Islam that these two individuals should also be killed. Some scholars argue about the individual who is not fighting. However, they all agree that to kill them in a group as a group protecting themselves with the sword is allowed. This is because fighting is more general than killing."* Infact, it is ijmaa` and mentioned in all the books of fiqh.**

In the first printing of this book, some doubts were raised by unknowledgeable people about this issue. But anyone who goes through a book of fiqh will find this ruling. It is only the people posing as shaikhs who hide this information from their students, who are unable to access the knowledge. Upon reading this footnote, someone telephoned us explaining that this footnote must be some mistake. The original footnote from the first edition did not have the quote from Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله or the last paragraph. We were told that indeed we had made an error in `aqidah (creed) by putting in this footnote. However, the author explained to the questioner on the phone that this was only a fiqh

issue, which was why it was mentioned in the footnote and not the main text of the work.

But the one in question was not to be stirred. Thus what happened next is that phone calls began to be circulated all over Britain, as well as to the United States that the author and editor of the book had 'made the private parts of property of Muslim women halaal for the taking' and other crude remarks. Some began to believe them while others were unsure, so we were flooded with a plethora of phone calls. Some brothers were actually so concerned that they actually came to see the editor on a personal level and question him on what exactly was written in the book.

Most of the people that had been told of this 'error in creed' had not even read the book all the way through nor the footnote. Thus it was absolutely necessary that we correct this error and make sense what has taken place. Unfortunately, there has been so much arrogance and so much immaturity in this matter; it has to be addressed properly.

The issues that were raised can fall under three categories:

1. Whether or not the Khawaarij are to be classed as kuffar as a part, a group or altogether and what the Sunna and the Book of Allah say in this regard.

2. Whether or not the Khawaarij and or the deviants can be fought and killed as we fight and kill the kuffar as listed in the footnote mentioned above.

3. If it is lawful for the Muslims to finish off the bodies of the wounded deviants fighting in a group or the Khawaarij who have taken to the sword.

1. ARE THE KHAWAARIJ CLASSED AS KUFFAR OR JUST DEVIANT MUSLIMS?

The Prophet (SAW) has mentioned in a number of ahaadith prophecies regarding the Khawaarij. At times, he has said that they will exit from the religion, and then at other times, he mentioned that he would kill them just as the people of `Aad and Thamud were killed. We will now narrate all of the ahaadith in this regard,

إنه يخرج من ضئضئ هذا قوم؛ يتلون كتاب الله رطباً، لا يجاوز حناجرهم، يمرقون من الدين كما يمرق السهم من الرمية، لئن أدركتهم لأقتلنهم قتل ثمود.

"Truly, there will come out from the offspring of this man a people, they will recite the book of Allah greatly and it will not go past their throats and they will leave out of the religion just as the arrow leaves

out of the game. If I was able to, I would kill them like the killing of Thamud."

سيخرج في آخر الزمان قوم أحداث الأسنان، سفهاء الأحلام، يقولون من خير قول البرية، يقرؤون القرآن، لا يجاوز حناجرهم، يمرقون من الدين كما يمرق السهم من الرمية، فإذا لقيمتموهم فاقتلوهم ، فإن في قتلهم أجراً لمن قتلهم عند الله يوم القيامة.

"There shall come in another time foolish and simple minded youth. They will say the best words of creation. They will recite the Qur'an and it will not go past their throats. They will go out of the religion, just as the arrow goes out of the game. Then, when you establish the proof on them, then kill them. Then if you kill them, in killing them is a reward in the sight of Allah on the Day of Resurrection."

سيقرأ القرآن رجال لا يجاوز حناجرهم، يمرقون من الدين كما يمرق السهم من الرمية.

"Men will recite the Qur'an and it will not go past their throats. They will leave out of the religion just as the arrow goes out of the game."

سيكون بعدي من أمتي قوم يقرؤون القرآن لا يجاوز حلا قيمهم--، يخرجون من الدين كما يخرج السهم من الرمية، ثم لا يعودون فيه، هم شر الخلق و الخليقة، سيما هم التحليق.

"After me, there will be from my Ummah people who will recite the Qur'an, and it will not go past their

throats. They will leave from the religion just as an arrow goes out of the prey. Then, they will not return to it. They are the worst of creation and the creatures."

سيكون في أمتي اختلف و فرقة، قوم يحسنون القيل، و يسيئون الفعل، يقرؤون القرآن لا يجاوز تراقيهم، يمرقون من الدين مروق السهم من الرمية، لا يرجعون حتى يرتد على فوقه، هم شرار الخلق و الخليقة، طوبي لمن قتلهم و قتلوه، يدعون إلى كتاب الله و ليسوا منه في شيء، من قاتلهم كان أولى بالله منهم سيما هم التحليق.

"There will be in my Ummah differences and division. A people will speak goodly and they will do sinful acts. They will recite the Qur'an and it will not go past their throats. They will leave out of the religion as an arrow leaves out of the game. They will not return until a part of it apostates. They are the worst of creation and creatures. So blessings and good tidings be to the one who kills them and they kill him."[114]

There was a second generation of Khawaarij in Dimashq (Damascus), and Abu Amaamah τ explains their story in the following hadith,

حدثنا أبو كريب، حدثنا وكيع بن ربيع بن صبيح و حماد بن سلمة، عن أبي غالب، قال: رأى أبو أمامة رؤوسا منصوبة على درج مسجد دمشق، فقالY أبو أمامة، كلاب النار شر قتلى تحت أديم السماء، خير القتلى من قتلوه.

[114] Taken from Sahih Muslim, Tirmidhi, Sahih alBukhari and the Sharh of An-Nawawi

In a hadith chain from Abu Kuraib τ in a chain from Waki`a bin Rabi`a bin Sabih τ and Hammad bin Salamah τ from Abu Ghaalib τ, who said that, *"Abu Amaamah τ saw severed heads on the steps of the masjid in Dimashq (Damascus) and he was weeping.* Abu Amaamah τ then said, *'The dogs of the hellfire (the Khawaarij) are the worst to be killed under the heaven and the one they killed is the best of people to be killed.'*[115] *Then he recited,*

يوم تبيض وجوه و تسود وجوه فأما الذين اسودت وجوههم اكفرتم بعد إيمانكم فذوقوا العذاب بما كنتم تكفرون. و أما الذين ابيضت وجوههم ففي رحمة الله هم فيها خالدون.

"On the day when faces will be whitened and faces will be blackened. Then to those whose faces are blacked, did you become kuffar after your Imaan? Then taste the punishment of what you disbelieved in. And as far as those whose faces were whitened, then they shall be forever in the mercy of Allah."[116]

"Then I said to Abu Amaamah τ, *'You heard it from the Messenger of Allah ρ?'* He said, *'If I did not hear it except once, twice, three, four or ever seven times, I would not have spoken it.*

The Prophet (SAW) said,

[115] Tafsir ulQur'an al`Azim, pages 517-519
[116] Surah Ali `Imraan, ayah 106,

'They will kill the Muslims and leave the pagans. If I were to be present when they appear, I would kill them as the killing of the nation of `Ad.'[117]

[117] Sahih al Bukhaari, V. 9, hadith 527

2. SPILLING THE BLOOD AND TAKING THE WEALTH OF THE KHAWAARIJ AND THE DEVIANTS FIGHTING IN A GROUP

From all of the ahaadith mentioned above, there were indeed some times when the Sahaaba as well as the Prophet (SAW) referred to the Khawaarij as kuffar. There is an ayah from the Qur'an and numerous ahaadith that give credence to this fact. But however, there were more doubts raised by those who wanted to do nothing more than divide Muslims.

The line of reasoning presented was that the ahaadith above are authentic and true, but our understanding of the ahaadith is completely erred and that we have made an 'error in creed'. It was also put forward that 'no classical scholar has ever issued such a ruling about the Khawaarij, whether some or all, were kuffar.'

Therefore, it was held by those raising these doubts that the writer and editor had deviated from the way of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah. But is this thinking sound?

It was due to the statement of Allah that was mentioned above as well as the ahaadith of the Prophet (SAW) describing the Khawaarij as going out of the religion and `Ad and Thamud that it can be understood why some came to the conclusion that the Khawaarij were kuffar. But those who sought to argue would not accept the outward of the ahaadith and said that what the author and editor of the book had stated had made the blood of

the deviant Khawaarij as well as the Muslims who deviate halaal.

However, this opinion is not correct, for indeed some scholars did hold that the Khawaarij were kuffar based on the ahaadith above as well as the ayah from the Qur'an. We will quote Shaikh ulIslam Muwaffaq ud-Din alMaqdisi (RH) who will explain,

"A group from the people of hadith believe that they (the Khawaarij) are kuffar and apostates and that their judgement is the judgement of kuffar and that their blood and their wealth is mubaah (permissible to take).

"And if they take themselves away to a place and they have and power, then they should be moved against just as the kuffar are moved against. And if they are in rebellion of the imaam, they should be made to repent, just as the apostates repent. And if they do, fine. If they do not, their necks are struck (they are killed). Their wealth becomes fai', and it is not inherited from by the Muslims, nor do they inherit from it." [118]

A similar incident regarding leaving and joining a group happened in the time of Abu Bakr As-Saddiq τ, in the time known as Hurub ur-Ridda, when a segment of the Arabian Peninsula refused to pay the zakah and apostated from Islam. Abu Bakr τ in this time was offered help by a man called Fujaa'a, who said he would

[118] alMughni, V. 10, Kitaabu Qitaali Ahl ilBughaa.

support the Sahaaba τ against the apostates. Abu Bakr τ and the Sahaaba τ accepted him and gave him men and equipment to fight the apostates. The problem was that instead of following orders, Fujaa'a and his men went on a rampage, killing Muslims as well as apostates. The news spread in the Peninsula that Abu Bakr τ and his Sahaaba τ sent an army to kill everyone.

This gave them a bad name in Madina. Abu Bakr τ and the Sahaaba τ then decided to put together an army and go and catch Fujaa'a. When they caught him, they brought him to Madina. He was tied up in the masjid and Abu Bakr ordered that he be burned alive. [119]

[119] For more information on this, please see Al Bidaayah wan-Nihaayah, al Kaamil and Taarikh at-Tabari. You may also refer to our work, the Khawaarij and Jihaad, p. 176. Thus the lesson to be gained from this narrative is that the Sahaaba τ and Abu Bakr τ did not stop fighting jihaad just because some group went deviant.

3. FINISHING OFF THE DEVIANTS AND THE SANCTITY OF THE BODIES OF THE KHAWAARIJ AND THE DEVIANTS

The next issue that was brought to the attention of the editor and the author of the Khawaarij and Jihaad book was that no classical scholar had ever allowed the finishing off of the bodies of the deviants nor anything of the like. It was then repeated again that 'no classical scholar had ever said this statement.' But this accusation was just as baseless as the one made in the previous subchapter. There are plenty of examples from the `ulama of finishing off the deviants. We will give just a few examples for those who are interested.

Imaam Abu Hanifa Nu`maan ibn Thaabit alKufi (RH) said about the Khawaarij and other groups of wrong that are fighting on the battlefield protecting themselves with the sword,

"The prisoner is to be killed and the injured one is to be finished off." [120]

In fact, so famous has this ruling of his become that subsequently many of the great Hanafi `ulama after him also subscribed to this view. We will give just one example of one of those stellar `ulama from Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah.

[120] Irshaad ulMustarshid, Baabu Kitaabi Ahl ilBughaa.

Shaikh ulIslam of his time, Badr ud-Din Mahmud al `Ayni رحمه الله, the great Hanafi `aalim, gives us advice to learn from this issue,

"Whoever made war to defend himself in stopping one of the obligations of Islam or stopping the right of someone, he must be fought and killed. If he defends himself and insists on not doing the obligation of Islam or stops the right of someone, his blood is nothing (Halaal)." [121]

From here, Imaam al`Aini has declared the blood of those who make war to defend themselves to be halaal. He didn't say kuffar, he said, whoever. This is clear proof that there is a difference between when the deviants are from the Ummah and when they are fighting in a group with the sword outside of the Muslim Ummah.

Another example will be from one of the personalities of the Hanbali madhhab. The Shaikh Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله commanded us,

"Whoever is calling for a bid`a or an astrayness and his evil won't stop unless he is killed, he should be killed, even if he pretended that he repented and he wasn't a kaafir. This is like the leaders of the Shi`a, who misguide

[121] Imaam al`Ayni, `Umdat ulQaari fi Sharhi Sahih al Bukhaari, Chapter on Denouncing, Denying or Refusing a fard, V. 24, page 81

people and likewise Muslims have killed Ghaiylaan alQadari, alJa`ad ibn Dirhim and their likes. [122] [123]

"The bid`ii person which went out of some of the Shari`a of the Messenger of Allah ρ and his Sunna, then he kills Muslims and confiscates their properties, it has more priority to fight him than the faasiq, even if he thinks that this is permissible in the religion to do." [124]

"Any party that refrains from following a single order from the apparent Shari`a of Islam, he should be fought until they are disciplined with the Shari`a, even if they were announcing the two shahaadas (the two statements of 'I bear witness that there is No god but Allah' and 'Muhammad is His Messenger') and practising some of the Shari`a." [125]

The shaikh has then made it clear hear that it does not matter if he is a Muslim and he is under interpretation. This is not to stop the Muslims from fighting him in any manner whatsoever. The person must be fought and he must be killed. This is therefore yet another proof showing that indeed the Khawaarij and other deviants

[122] The two aforementioned characters went on to form their own movements, with alQadari founding the Qadariyyah movement, those who deny the power of Qadr in Islam, and Dirhem denying the names and attributes of Allah I and doing corruption and distortion with the names.

[123] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 28, p. 528
[124] Ibid., V. 28, p. 471
[125] Ibid,, V. 28

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

that have taken to the sword can also be killed when they are in a group and they have gone outside of the Ummah.

Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله, said,

"It is narrated on the authority of `Ali τ and `Umar τ as well as the consensus of the scholars of Islam that these two individuals should also be killed. Some scholars argue about the individual who is not fighting. However, they all agree that to kill them in a group as a group protecting themselves with the sword is allowed. This is because fighting is more general than killing."[126]

Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah, in clarifying the way of fighting the people of bid`a yet again gives us words to benefit from in this regard,

'The second way of fighting the Khawaarij as well as fighting the people who did not pay the zakaah, the Khawaarij and those of their like are not like fighting the people of the Jamal and Siffin.[127] *And this is what the majority of the scholars, the previous ones and the*

[126] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 28, pgs. 476-479
[127] The people of the Jamal is making reference to Ghazwat ulJamal, in which the wife of the Prophet (SAW), Umm ulMuminin `Aisha (RAA) was involved. And Ghazwat us-Siffin, the war of Siffin, was the warfare that took place between `Ali (RAA) and Mu`awiyah (RAA). This statement of Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah (RH) is a clear proof that Ahl us-Sunna do make a difference between the wrong doers (Ahl ulBughaa) and the bid`ii people (Ahl ulBid`a), who are either fighting for a new bid`a or are protecting themselves with the sword.

imams have stated and this is the `aqidah of Ahl us-Sunna. And this is the madhhab of Ahl ulMadina, like Maalik and other people and the Madhhab of the imams of hadith, like Ahmad and others.

'And they have stated this in more than one place. ***Even in their money, some of them said that it is allowed to take the wealth and ghanima of the Khawaarij.*** *In one statement, Ahmad said according to Abu Taalib in Harawiyyah, they (the Khawaarij) had a piece of land in the village, and they started to go out and kill Muslims and fight Muslims. But the Muslims killed them and* ***their land was given to Muslims.*** *Then the land was divided into fifths (like what you do with the land of the kuffar) and 4/5 of which goes to the fighters than fought them or the amir of the battle can divide it and make it into an endowment for all of the Muslims.*

'And it should not be divided for only the fighters, like what `Umar did when he took the land of Egypt in Sawaa and made it an endowment for the Muslims. ***And Ahmad said that the land that is taken as booty, it is exactly as the money that has been taken from the kuffar. And in general this is the way that is the correct and decisive way (in fighting the Khawaarij).***

'The verses and the ijmaa` have differentiated between **this** *type of fighting (the fighting of the evil doers) and* ***this*** *(the fighting of the Khawaarij as mentioned above).'*[128]

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله made the following analysis,

"According to the madhhab of Ahmad ibn Hanbal, what about those who stopped paying the Zakah if they fight the Imaam for it, are they kuffar even if they admit they should do it? He says two opinions on the matter. On one occasion he said that they were ***kuffar*** *and another occasion he said that* ***they were not.***

"The commentary to this is that the Sahaaba have unanimously accepted and the Imaams after them to fight the people who stopped paying the Zakah, even if they pray five times and fast the month of Ramadaan. Those kinds of people had no acceptable explanation for their actions. This is why they were called apostates and fought, because they stopped paying the Zakah even if they admit that they should pay the Zakah as Allah ordered."[129]

"And the Mongols and their likes are more worse in having left Islam and the Shari`a of Islam than the people who stopped paying the zakah, the Khawaarij and the people of Ta'if who stopped making Riba (usury) Haraam.

---

[128] Majmu`a Fataawa, V. 28, pgs. 480-485
[129] Majmu` Fataawa vol.28 page 518

*"And whoever has doubts to fight the likes of these Mongols**, he is one of the most ignorant people about Islam.** [130] And whenever you see them (the Mongols), you should kill them. Even if amongst them there are those that don't want to fight by unanimity of the Muslims. Like the Uncle of the Messenger ρ at the battle of Badr, when he said, 'I was forced to go with them'. Then the Messenger ρ said,*

'From your apparent you are against us and your intention is between you and Allah.' [131]

"And we do not know who is forced and not forced, we cannot distinguish between them. If we fight them according the order of Allah I we will have the ajar (reward) from Allah I and Allah I will burden us if we

[130] Notice that Taqi ud-Din Ahmad ibn Taymiyyahرحمه الله didn't say, *'Whoever has doubts to fight the likes of these Mongols, he is a kaafir.'* This is precisely due to the fact that the people of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah, when they see the reality, they don't accuse other people who don't think like them. There were many `Ulama in the time of the Shaikh رحمه الله who didn't think that the jihaad against the Mongols (also called Tatars) was valid, yet Shaikh ulIslam رحمه الله didn't call them kuffar. This is clearly from the manners of Ahl us-Sunna that when you differ with someone, even if you are right, you maintain the proper manners. This statement of the Shaikh رحمه الله comes as a stab in the heart to the takfiri, who wants to label anyone who disagrees with him as a kaafir, and the member of the Khawaarij, who wants to kill anyone who disagrees with him as a kaafir. For more detailed information, please see our research, ***The Khawaarij and Jihaad***

[131] Ibid., V. 28, page 546

make any mistakes after that. And they (i.e. those killed) will be resurrected according to their niyyah (intention). Those who are forced to go with the enemies of Allah to fight the believers will come on the Day of Judgement according to their niyyah. If he is killed because that (i.e. the religion of Allah) is to prevail, his killing is not much worse to the Muslims than the Muslims who are killed fighting for the Shari`a of Allah Y." [132]

"It is known from the religion by necessity, and unanimously by the Muslims to fight any group that stopped one Shari`a of Islamic Shari`a which is apparent and no body can dispute about it." [133]

"The apostates, they must be killed until they go back from whatever makes them apostates and whoever fights from them he should be killed. [134] *Even those that do not fight from (amongst) them should be killed like the old man, the blind, the very weak and their women according to the majority (jamhur)."* [135]

In quoting from the Maaliki imams, we will quote from the best of them. The great Maaliki scholar and the great Qaadi, Imaam `Iyaad ibn Musa ibn `Iyaad ibn `Amru

[132] Ibid., V. 28, page 547
[133] ibid., V. 28, p. 556
[134] What can anyone say to Allah I when he reads these words and he remembers the Mujaahidin all over the Earth fighting for the Shari`a.? How can any one of us accuse them, and they are doing the work for Islam?
[135] Majmu` Fataawa vol.28 page 414

alYahsabi al Andalusi [136] رحمه الله gave us a statement of great importance,

"For someone to say La ilaha illallah it is a sign that he has responded to imaan, it is only accepted alone from the people who used to be Mushrikun (pagans) before. But those who are already saying La ilaha illallah, it is not enough for them to be protected (i.e. blood and wealth) by saying La ilaha illallah and doing other kinds of kufr." [137]

Thus if a group is doing kufr, minor or major and taking to the sword with it and defending itself, it is not enough to claim immunity by saying, La ilaha illallah. For they are already indeed saying the testimony of faith but they are violating it. And the Khawaarij and other deviants are no exception, just as we have heard narrated by the other great scholars that we have quoted from before this one.

The grand imaam, Shaikh ulIslam Ibn Qudaamah رحمه الله spoke further,

"Then as far as the Banu Hanifa, then it is not established by any that had monitored them that they had preceded to Islam. All of the Banu Hanifa had not

[136] This is a famous Maaliki scholar of origin from Morocco but based in al Andalus, known for his works such as ash-Shifa' and many other books to his credit.
[137] Ash-Shifaa', V. 2, pgs. 230-250

become Muslim. Only some of them had become Muslim. And the most correct opinion is that the men had become Muslim. So from amongst those who established the Islam, among them is Thumaamah ibn Uthal and from those who have apostated are those who have among them ad-Dajjaal alHanafi."[138]

Thus every single on of them was not classed as a kaafir. But due to the fact that they took their women and their belongings with them, they were then fought as the kuffar are to be fought and their wealth was taken. There were Muslims among them, and as the imaam said, the men were Muslim, but that did not matter. When someone defends a bid`a, they are fought. This is just a further proof that when the Sahaaba gave them the title of apostates, it was a general title and it did not mean each and every one.

Thus from what the imaam stated above, if the title apostate was all encompassing, the apostate women would have been killed just as some of the men. They would not have been taken as captives. They would have been killed immediately as kaafir women. How do we know that? Shaikh ulIslam Muwaffaq ud-Din Ibn Qudaamah رحمه الله cautions us,

[138] AlMughni, V. 10, issue 7084

"And whoever apostates from Islam from the men or the women, it is compulsory to KILL them according to the words of the Prophet (SAW),

من بدل دينه فاقتلوه

'Whoever changes their religion, then kill him.'"[139] [140]

Let us go to the statement of al`Allamah Abu Muhammad alMaqdisi رحمه الله,

"And the people of knowledge have made ijmaa` on killing the apostates. And that is related from Abu Bakr, `Umar, `Uthmaan, `Ali, Mu`aadh, Abu Musa, Ibn `Abbas and not one denied it, therefore it is ijmaa`" [141]

Thus we know very clearly that this is indeed the way that apostate women are treated. But the women in the Banu Hanifa were not killed but quite the contrary, they were taken hostage. So what does this mean? It means that they were not apostates, but treated generally as a group of kufr. But all of what the accusations against us show is that the person is not balanced in fiqh to even a minor degree.

---

[139] Collected by the Imaams alBukhaari, at-Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud, an-Nisaai, alBaihaqi, ad-Daara Qutni, Ibn Maajah, Ahmad and classified as sahih.
[140] Al `Uddah, Baabu Hukm ulMurtadd.
[141] Al `Uddah, Baabu Hukm ulMurtadd.

In summary, those who had the difference had no right to become so rigid about the difference, for the difference was not a difference in creed, but one in fiqh. This is why all of the books that have been quoted in regard to the topic have been books of fiqh. Not one book of creed has been quoted, for the issue is not one of creed, but of fiqh. And we challenge any one that is arguing to find this issue in one of the books of creed.

And if they don't, as indeed they will not, then let them come to the conclusion that the issue is not one of creed, but one of fiqh, this is why there is difference of opinion in that regard. But as we had stated on previous occasions, either the man that is spurring people into these arguments is intentionally deceiving people, or he is ignorant of the difference between a fiqh and creed issue and is floored with regard to his knowledge. And this can mean nothing but disaster for those who follow him in his madness.

The Second Point of Controversy

There was a great controversy regarding the release of our book, entitled The Khawaarij and Jihad, and in on page 131, it mentions the Khawaarij in the West.

The chapter reads, 'The Khawaarij in the West,'

As of yet, there has been no appearance of the Khawaarij in the West. There has been however, an alarming rise in the takfiri thinking in recent years. These people who are takfiri in idea have not graduated to full Khawaarij yet, because they have not begun to kill for their idea, as of yet. All that is happening now is just talk. This is what separates those who are takfiri from the authentic Khawaarij. We should also note that every Khawaarij is takfiri, but not every takfiri is Khawaarij.

We should bear in mind the statement of the Prophet (SAW) in which he said, *'They will kill Muslims and leave alone the pagans..."* Sahih Muslim and Sahih ulBukhaari. This hadith is classified Sahih. The Prophet (SAW) never said, *'They will just make takfir on the Muslims and leave the pagans.'*

The pseudo-Khawaarij in the West are just takfiris as of yet and have not yet began to spill Muslim blood for their beliefs. Thus the Khawaarij and their takfiri counterparts can be filed into four categories,

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

1. The Khawaarij that are in power, who must be fought and never be allowed to take any part in authority over Muslims in matters of honour, blood or wealth. These will be explained further in the book in the chapter entitled, *The Ruling Khawaarij.*

2. The Khawaarij fighting apostate and bid`ii regimes like the Shi`ii and so on. These Khawaarij we leave to fight these regimes and hope that they will destroy each other. But the moment they go for Muslim blood, they should be fought without doubt. The Muslims should also be warned of the Khawaarij activities and prepare themselves in the event that they (will) have to battle with them. These people will be covered in more detail in the chapter, 'What about the Khawaarij of Algeria?'

3. The Khawaarij who are actually fighting the Muslims, who should be fought relentlessly until they come to the truth or they are eliminated.

4. Next are the takfiris, who haven't graduated fully to the class of Khawaarij. They are just referring to others as kuffar, with incorrect ideas and understanding of Qur`anic ayaat and in some cases giving out secret teachings.

Unfortunately, we have people of category four above today, who are using this same ideology (today), with regard to takfir to build their own empire. Those that become part of the empire initially are greeted with good cheer and welcome. But as time goes on, their absolute loyalty is demanded, and any attempt to leave the group is seen as going into apostasy or at the very least hypocrisy.

Sometimes the takfiris start dirty wars against dissenters or deserters of their group by asking their wife/husband to leave their spouse because they refuse to listen to the new holy shaikh. In some cases the takfiri leadership does the separation without even the consent of the person whom they classed as a dissident. The major sign of the leaders of such groups is that they are not people of action. So while they declare rulers by other than Allah, *Azza wa Jall (Mighty and Majestic) kuffar*, or grave worshippers kuffar, they are not willing to change that evil with their hand.

Those among them that speak of Tawhid alHaakimiyyah will not do what it takes to at least try to implement the Haakimiyyah, i.e training, going for jihaad, giving the benefit of doubt to those that do jihaad, etc. Most often, they accuse the people doing jihaad of deviancy, so people don't follow their action, as well as fostering jealousy towards the people of jihaad. They defame the

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

character of the mujaahidin, so that people will not follow them or ask them for advice. It is very clear for a Muslim with a clear conscience that if you believe in something, you should do something about it, not just say something about it. Instead of becoming the Islamic armed group they become the Islamic-slandering group.

These takfiri leaders have become machine guns of takfir. The followers of these groups like the social aspect more than (the) learning (of) the religion of *Allah Azza wa Jall (Mighty and Majestic)*.

This quote that we have given from our book is from pages 131 to 133.

CONCLUSION

There are a few points that need to be kept in mind at the conclusion of this work:

1. The excessive and unfounded (without evidence or method of Ahl us-Sunna) takfir is actually a state of ill will or an unhealthy mind or sick mind which are in a state of rebellion against their surrounding or the people who are around them. And this sick mentality contains a desire for retaliation against those who oppose them in opinion and action. Therefore, we must warn people against this type of mentality and attitude, for it is a definite harm hidden under the cloak of religion and discipline. Hence the statement of the Messenger against the Takfiri and Khawaarij are stern and decisive indeed. He said, that they will fly out of the religion. That is their description and when it comes to the verdict against them, 'I will kill them as the killing of Aad and Thamud,' which means to be killed as the worst of the kuffar. This is why some scholars call the Khawaarij kuffar in one moment and sometimes they do not due to this clear statement of the Messenger. However, they all agree in the end that if they group together and cause physical harm to Muslims, they should be fought harshly.

2. To understand that the unfounded takfir is a kind of false allegation, which it's penalty in the Hereafter is equal to murder. This is why in the hadith of Bukhaari, it was expressed as throwing ramaa takfir at a believer,

as if it is a sharp weapon against his sanctity. In another word, he projected with projectiles qadhafa, both words meaning throwing something to kill, as if he has killed the believers. Killing a believer without right is one of the major sins, let alone that Allah said that whoever calls a person with something that he does not deserve, on the day of judgment, Allah will make that person to hold that title, along with the angels and others and this will be stamped on his forehead.

3. Unfounded takfir is not the whole story, but the beginning of the serious harm, with the conclusion being what we expressed in our work, The Khawaarij and Jihaad and it is a harm to the individual who have been called kuffar. As expected, many of the people in dawa have had their money taken by the takfiris or had their belly split by them and their extremism and it is only the door to further terror. Also, the wives of the people in dawa have been taken from them if the takfiris have influence on the wives of a wronged believer through blood relation or even sometimes they send the wives of brothers to intoxicate the believers wives so they can ask for divorce from their husbands.

4. Some takfiris are blaming other Muslims for the pro-apostate governments using their statements to protect the people who do not rule by the Shari`a from being given the title of kufr and to advance their legitimacy to hurt the Ummah even more. But this is not new. On the other hand, the Murji' people sometimes call them Khawaawij when we apply the methodology for the

enemies of Islam and they are dealt with according to what they deserve. Ahl us-Sunna are the people of wisdom and wisdom is the balance between the two extremes, those being negligence and exaggeration. Muslims should not exaggerate as the Khawaarij and Takfiri, but they should not be negligent as the Murji'a are in that sense. And due to the fact that it is not possible to please everyone, we must please Allah and follow in the footsteps of the Prophet and those who followed him from the previous generations.

5. Some people call the Muslims that are striving as different from the groups and they are trying to link them to the nearest group that they hate. Other sincere Muslims suggest that those people should be called Khawaarij, Murji'a and other things merely due to the fact that they have been slandered. Again, this is not the way of Ahl us-Sunna when they deal with people that oppose them in debates and discussions for as long as there is no physical abuse or harm. And let us remember one thing, and that is that we do not deal with people according to their opinion about us, but we deal with people according to Allah's opinion about them and His instruction to the believers on how to deal with them. This should be the method for anyone who is working in da`awa, for there is always disagreement on a certain level.

6. Usually the takfirs or the Khawaarij use the same verses that Ahl us-Sunna use, but with their own interpretation, without misquoting. But from the

BE AWARE OF TAKFIR!

example given in this book, we are coming to a serious development of these takfiris, which is a combination of misquoting and misunderstanding as well. There is also deliberate hiding of the relevant ayaat and statements concerning the matters.

7. The students are indeed a captive audience. And so they cannot go directly to the sources. So while they might not be takfiris in belief, those who have taught them want to divide the Ummah and take a large portion of the Ummah away from Islam, away from the truth and salvation of Allah and away from learning the things that Allah will surely ask them about on the Day of Resurrection.

And with that, we have concluded our investigation. And to the students of this man, after listening to the tape, and understanding the principles on this tape, and the other tapes that will be put together [insha `Allah], they should look for the evidence, and should understand the evidence. And if it is found that what we are saying is right, they should stop listening to the 'shaikh' under investigation, and they should correct the 'shaikh'. And if he refuses to be corrected as he has for several years, he should be ostracised.

For indeed, they need the most help. And there are two manifestations that we can observe with the takfiris. The first one is the confused takfiri, the one that is part of the captive audience.

Imaam Ahmad said, You do not pray on the Khawaarij. There were tow opinions in the time of Ahmad according to the rule. So Ahmad's view was to kill them as kuffar, to initiate attack, kill the wounded and if you catch them you make them repent like the kuffar. LiAlMughni, V. 10.

Al Bidaayah wan-Nihaayah, V. 1, pge 300, he lied saying that Imaam Ibn Kathir said that `Ali never took the Khawaarij wealth or belongings. Explain the difference between Awliyaa and Asdaqaa as mentioned in Surat ulMa'idah, ayah 51.